THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Very Rev. S. C. Carpenter, D.D., The Deanery, Exeter, to whom MSS. should be sent. Reviews and all business communications should be addressed to S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C. 2.

Vol. XXXI AUGUST, 1935 No. 182

EDITORIAL

The late Lord Halifax was such a paladin of Christendom, and so much honoured and beloved among ourselves, that it is good to be reminded, though we always knew it, that he was held in high regard elsewhere. Father Bolton, a Roman Catholic priest, has published *A Catholic Memorial of Lord Halifax and Cardinal Mercier* (Williams and Norgate, 3s. 6d.). The book contains incidentally not a little about Dupanloup, Duchesne, and that remarkable Fellow of Trinity, Gerard Francis Cobb. But the main topics are the attempt of 1894-1896 and the Malines Conversations. The author is clearly a man of generous sympathies, and his work is a model of both friendliness and discretion. One sentence—"In Rome, and especially in ecclesiastical Rome, the difference between things written in French and things written in English is between things read and things unread"—has a bearing upon the value of that excellent periodical *Œcumenica*. The book does not add much to Lord Halifax's *Leo XIII. and Anglican Orders*, but Father Bolton makes it clearer than ever that Leo XIII. was friendly; Cardinal Vaughan, Abbot Gasquet and Canon Moyes were hostile; and Archbishop Benson (though his position was admittedly difficult), not very forthcoming. But it is instructive to remember that the decision of 1896 in regard to the validity of Anglican Orders was to a large extent governed by precedent. There was the case of Dr. John Clement Gordon in 1704, and a like case in 1684. Gasquet unearthed a Bull of earlier date, *Præclara Charissimi*, which gave authority to Cardinal Pole, sometime Dean of Exeter, who was nearly elected to the Papacy in 1550, for his severe treatment of the Edwardine clergy. Yet the language of that Bull cries aloud for further definition. It provides that "those who have been given Ecclesiastical Orders by anyone not a Bishop or Archbishop validly ordained must receive those orders

again from their ordinary, and in the meantime must not minister in the said Orders." A further Brief sets forth that "validly ordained" means "ordained and consecrated in the form of the Church." Much clearly depends on the meaning of the words employed.

Father Bolton quotes a statement of Canon Moyes that "the question was also considered fully on its own merits, as though the Holy See had never made any previous decision." But he adds a paragraph from the biographer of Cardinal Vaughan to the effect that "The discovery of these documents not only shortened the labours of the Pontifical Commission, but obviously was well calculated to have an important influence on the decision of the Holy See. Leo XIII. had ordered that the whole question should be considered anew, but it was at least antecedently probable that the same evidence would bring the same verdict and that the facts which had convinced judges of the sixteenth century as to the invalidity of Anglican Orders would also serve to satisfy the judges of the nineteenth." And further, he says, "The sense of frustration and disappointment felt by Lord Halifax and by all who had worked with him was all the greater because they believed that all their efforts had never counted, since the Bull began with the words: 'Everyone must see that the question raised in our time had long before been definitely decided by the sentence of the Apostolic See.'" The account given of the Malines Conversations is friendly and constructive, and does full justice to that great Christian prelate Cardinal Mercier. Readers can detect in Father Bolton's references evidence of his distaste for "diplomacy." The book has no Imprimatur and emanates from the firm which published *Father Jerome's Catholic Plea for Reunion.*

To turn from recent to old history, we notice that the *Tablet* takes it much amiss that Bishop Fisher and Sir Thomas More should be commemorated in Rochester Cathedral and Old Chelsea Church, or indeed by the Church of England at all. We see no inconsistency. The only drawback of the Anglican commemoration is that it calls attention to the divided state of Christendom. But that is, unhappily, a fact, and just as it is better to confess sins than to commit them, so it is better to repudiate a cruel tyrant and to glorify a noble name than to be silent about one of the most splendid episodes of that portion of our history which we share with the English Roman Catholics. It is of course part of the brisker sort of Roman Catholic propa-

ganda to suggest that the Church of England began in the sixteenth century and was the creation of Henry VIII. or Luther (a wide choice). We have no intention of entering here upon this major issue. Pausing only to remark that this position is becoming more and more impossible to maintain, and rests, as the late Lord Asquith once said, "upon imperfect historical information," we concede, as of course we must, that Fisher and More, like the whole Church of England till the Reformation, were in communion with the Pope, and were indeed more Papalist than a good many. They died for it. But we are as much entitled to commemorate them as we are to commemorate Alfred or Dunstan, or Chaucer or Longland, Alcuin or Bede. This is the general case.

It is, to be accurate, rather an understatement of the case. The Celtic Christianity of the North during a considerable period before and after the coming of St. Augustine was curiously independent of Rome. St. Aidan, whose 1,300th anniversary has just been observed with great glory at Lindisfarne, had no papal authority. And, although there was complete identity of faith, the customs of Northumbrian Catholicism were in some respects so different from the Roman customs that Wilfrid of York was gravely exercised about it. It seemed to him that the irregularity was serious. It was not till the Synod of Whitby that England as a whole came into line. This, though superficially it turned on a bit of exegetical special pleading, was no doubt a wise step. It would have been a mistake to go on being insular. It would have meant being cut off from the larger life and culture of the continent. Yet Aidan stands for much in the history of English Christianity. There is only slight exaggeration in Lightfoot's wellknown words: "Iona succeeded where Rome had failed." "Not Augustine but Aidan is the true apostle of English Christianity." Aidan had no authority from Rome. Yet he is commemorated in the Roman Catholic Calendar on August 31 as a Saint of the Church. It seems that it was not always deemed essential that a Christian should be in visible and demonstrable communion with the Pope.

But to return to More. There are some peculiar circumstances. What sort of Pope's man was he? In one sense he was a good strong one. Dom Bede Jarrett says: "Remember the Papacy More lived under. He lived under the worst of the Renaissance Popes: Alexander VI. ruled and died within More's lifetime.

That is to say, the Papacy he knew was not the Papacy that you and I know and reverence—great, purified, outstanding, spiritual. That is the marvel of his faith. That is where so much of his exquisite discernment shews up against his time when the rest of the world went astray. He died for the Papacy that, as far as men could see, was little else than a a small Italian princedom ruled by some of the least reputable of the Renaissance princes" (*The Fame of Blessed Thomas More*, p. 113). All this is true. More swallowed a good deal. It is not to be supposed that he liked it, but he endured it, as many a Roman Catholic, many an Anglican, many an Orthodox and many a Protestant Christian has endured things which were distressing, but not, in his judgment, quite intolerable. There was, as often, a choice of evils, and schism, as often, was rightly held to be the greater of the two. "No corruption," said one of the Erasmus group, "can be great enough to justify a defection from the Church. Were it not better for each to try to reform what exists than to experiment in creating something new? It were well to bend all our thoughts to improving the old institution and curing its defects." This was the old view, the Erasmian view.

Henry VIII., Edward and Queen Mary between them presently made it impossible for a great many to maintain.

Nevertheless, in other matters More was a papalist of a temperate sort—in fact, of the Old English sort. Thus, when the King wrote his famous work, the reward of which may still be seen on every British coin, More ventured to be a protester: "At the first reading whereof I moved the King's Highness either to leave out that point or else to touch it more slenderly, for doubt of such things as after might hap to fall in question between his Highness and some Pope, as between princes and Popes divers times have done. Whereunto his Highness answered me that he would in no wise anything minish of that matter, of which thing his Highness shewed me a secret cause, whereof I never had anything heard before." This is from More's own letter to Cromwell. Son-in-law William Roper tells us what the secret was. "The King said, 'We received from that See our crown Imperial': which till his grace with his own mouth told it me, I never heard of before." The King's policy in the first half of his reign was to serve the temporal interests of the Papacy. This More never liked, and, as against it, he was a nationalist. But when it came to useless wars with France, or to the kind of nationalism which is used as a cloak for carnal lust, he was a Catholic (and Christian) internationalist.

The great service rendered by Professor Chambers' admirable book (*Sir Thomas More*, Jonathan Cape, 12s. 6d.) is to shew that More was not at first (in *Utopia*) a Protestant at heart, who later degenerated into a Catholic. The apparent "Protestantism" of Utopia, mingled with which is in any case a good deal of Catholic furniture and ceremonial, is intended to be a challenge to Christendom. It is like the reliance of the Schoolmen on Reason. It is like Dante's veneration for Virgil. It is like the commendations in the mediæval moralists of the cardinal virtues. It is based on what Von Hügel used to speak of as the delicate mediæval distinction between the natural and the supernatural. There was no intention in the mediæval mind of giving anything but a welcome to the natural virtues nor of denying their divine provenance. More's point was that the reasonings and the intuitions of the Utopians are competent to lead men a long way up the hill at the top of which the Christian Revelation and the supernatural virtues stand ready to take over. They supersede the trusty but pedestrian guide who had led the travellers up the lower slopes.

In one respect Professor Chambers seems willing to fasten upon Anglicans an inferiority complex. He nowhere happens to attempt to estimate the precise share which the Church of England may rightly claim in Sir Thomas, and it may be that he himself would be disposed to divide the world into Roman Catholics and non-Catholics. But this is what he says:

> "I am not forgetting that More died for the Papacy, 'suffering death in and for the faith of the Holy Catholic Church,' that his blessing belongs of right to those of the faith for which he died, and that the rest of us can only have such blessing as poor Esau claimed, who had lost his birthright: 'Hast thou but one blessing: bless me, even me also, O my father.'"

The comparison is perhaps less damaging than it sounds, inasmuch as Esau was in point of fact the elder brother. And he continues:

> "And indeed some very strange and hairy Esaus are clamouring for the blessing of Saint Thomas More. That the love of Thomas More unites those who might seem to be separated by a considerable gulf is shewn by the fact that the Karl Marx-Engels Institute of the Central

Executive Committee of the Union of Soviet Republics should have been seeking for information about that great Communist Sir Thomas More from the Sisters of the Beaufort Street Convent, who maintain ceaseless adoration, with prayer that the crime of our people in slaying Sir Thomas More may be forgiven. 'It proved impossible for us to find out the name and address of these ladies,' says the letter from the Marx-Engels Institute which ultimately reached my hands. 'We would be infinitely obliged to you for letting us know what you have found out in this direction.'"

Which things are a parable.

A little book, *New Yet Old*, has been written by a Cambridge undergraduate, Denzil Laborde, and is published by Heffer and Sons at 2s. 6d. The sub-title is "Talks on Christian Belief and Practice in Daily Life." It is very well done. Mr. Laborde has a very mature understanding of the Faith, and his style is persuasive. His argument is that Christianity is not a moral code, but a Gospel (*Sic Deus dilexit mundum*). It springs from the divine initiative, and it demands the response of a religion which is both personal and sacramental. There are two good chapters and a short appendix on the Eucharist. The "change" that takes place at consecration is described as a "change of values," but at one point the Real Presence is spoken of in terms which suggest a hypostatic union. The whole book is written in a spirit of eager devotion, and, whereas the presentation of the Faith to students is sometimes couched overmuch in terms of a "world-philosophy for this generation," these pages, while they occasionally miss a chance of enlarging the range, make a direct and searching appeal to that which is after all at the centre of the world—the conscience of man. A remarkable little book.

THE CLOUDS OF HEAVEN: AN ESCHATOLOGICAL STUDY

"THE Christians thought that the end was very near. They expected any day to see Jesus return on the clouds and all the imperial strength and splendour of the pagan world melt to nothing at His glance."* To challenge so typical an utterance, repeated in a hundred books, would seem rash. But such is the purpose of this essay; or at least to subject the commonly received opinion to re-examination. A study of Jewish eschatology will have taught the reader that the problem is complicated. He will be prepared to find primitive Christian eschatology as varied and ambiguous as Jewish; and so drastic a simplification as is here proposed will seem suspicious.

To state the thesis in a provocative way. When Our Lord said: "Ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power and coming with the clouds of heaven," He referred to His Ascension, not to a Descent; to His vindication by the Father, and only indirectly to a judgment of the world. The true meaning of His words was gradually lost until in the second century they were taken to mean a coming *from* heaven, an interpretation so firmly established that any other seems paradoxical.

I

We begin by examining the Old Testament antecedents of the phrases used: first, the conception of cloud or clouds and their relation to the Divine Being; then the Davidic King as a divine, or semi-divine, being. The source of Christ's words in Daniel will best be treated along with the evidence of the apocalypses.

Palestine has two seasons: the rainy or winter season from October to April, sometimes May, and the summer or dry season, occupying the rest of the year, when clouds are rarely seen; though early morning mists are not uncommon. The clouds are naturally associated with the beneficent activity of God, especially in the autumn, when agriculture is made possible by the early rains and hope is born again at "the turn of the year." They also shew His power, especially in thunderstorms, with which perhaps the name Yahweh is connected.

The Hebrews inherited many religious ideas from their predecessors in the Syrian land. Thus in the Ras Shamra Tablets Baal's (Hadad's) son Aleyn, who personifies winter, has as his

* E. Bevan, *Christianity*, p. 33.

characteristic name "he who rides upon the clouds."* The way in which the Hebrews settled in Palestine connected their new† religious phraseology with the desert period of their history is shewn by Judges v. 4, where Yahweh comes from Seir, the field of Edom, in a thunderstorm; also by Deut. xxxiii. 2: "Yahweh came from Sinai, and rose from Seir unto them; he shined forth from Mount Paran, and he came from the thousands of holy ones: at his right hand was fire, a law unto them."‡ The multitude of clouds following one another on a stormy day would naturally suggest companions, "hosts" accompanying Yahweh.

Other passages which convey the same meaning are Deut. xxxiii. 26: "God . . . rideth upon the heaven for thy help, and in his excellency on the skies." Psalm xviii. 10 (=2 Samuel xxii. 11): "He rode upon a cherub, and did fly: yea, he flew swiftly upon the wings of the wind," etc.§ Psalm civ. 3: "Who maketh the clouds his chariot." Isaiah xix. 1: "Yahweh rideth upon a swift cloud, and cometh unto Egypt." Jeremiah iv. 13: "Behold, he shall come up as clouds, and his chariots shall be as the whirlwind."

To this we must add Zechariah ii. 13, in the Greek version: "Be silent, all flesh, before Yahweh: for he is waked up from the clouds of his holy ones."

Broadly speaking we may say that Yahweh rides on the *clouds*. But there is another religious use of the word, in the singular, in which the cloud represents the presence of God. It is stationary, descends, or rises. We may suggest that, the clouds and especially the thunderstorm being traditionally associated with Yahweh, the summer mists which collected on the hilltops and were dissolved in the rays of the sun were also taken to symbolize His presence. The use of incense in the sanctuaries would also suggest the cloud that stood for the Divine Presence.

The passages are too numerous to quote in full. They occur largely, be it noted, in the later sections of the tradition. The cloud represents the glory and the presence of God: "I come unto thee in a thick cloud" (Exod. xix. 9). "The pillar of cloud descended, and stood at the door of the tent: and (Yahweh) spake with Moses" (xxxiii. 9). In xxxiv. 5 "Yahweh descended in the cloud," and stood with Moses.‖ Moses enters into the midst of the cloud (xxiv. 18). In xl. 34 the cloud *is* the glory: "Then the cloud covered the tent of meeting, and

* J. W. Jack, *The Ras Shamra Tablets*, p. 15.

† This cannot be proved; but at least we may say that Egypt was an unlikely home of origin for the symbolic use of clouds.

‡ The imagery of a storm is unmistakable.

§ Note the downpour of rain which followed.

‖ A thunderstorm can hardly be the basis of the symbolism here.

the glory of Yahweh filled the tabernacle." The same cloud accompanies Israel on their journeys, appearing as a cloud by day and fire by night (36-38). In Leviticus xvi. 2, "I will appear in the cloud upon the mercy-seat," we seem to have an allusion to the incense, as also in 2 Chronicles v. 13, 14: "the house was filled with a cloud . . . for the glory of Yahweh filled the house of God."

It will be convenient to pursue this line of thought into the New Testament. The cloud, as distinct from clouds, comes in the story of the Transfiguration, where it symbolizes the presence of God. So presumably it does in the story of the Ascension,* as it clearly does in St. Paul's reference to the cloud of the Exodus (1 Cor. x. 1, 2).†

What the cloud meant for the Jews of the first century may be gathered from the mosaic floor of the recently excavated synagogue at Beth Alpha in the Plain of Esdraelon. One panel depicts the sacrifice of Isaac. Above the altar is "a radiant cloud, projecting in part beyond the frame of the panel proper, from which projects an open hand; below it is written 'Lay not (thy hand).'" The hand is God's power, the cloud is God. The parallel to the cloud of the Transfiguration and the Ascension is exact.‡

II

Our next inquiry concerns the implications of Our Lord's words to the High Priest, based on the 110th Psalm, "sitting at the right hand of power (*i.e.* God)." What Messianic conception underlies this claim? The ordinary material illustrating the Davidic Messianic King is too familiar to need collecting here. I want, however, to call attention to recent work on the Psalms, which is too speculative to be accepted at present without reserve, but does contribute valuable material to our study.

A number of the Psalms are now considered§ to be liturgies composed in monarchical times for the Davidic King, whose New Year Accession Feast has attracted so much attention of late. It is true that this method of interpretation involves a good deal of reading between the lines, and the assumption (which presents no difficulty) that in post-exilic times, when the monarchy had been abandoned and its ideals were assailed both by the Deutero-

* See below for a suggestion about this.

† Other occurrences of νεφέλη in the singular are Luke xii. 54 (of a literal cloud); Luke xxi. 27 (symbolic, see below); and Rev. x. 1, xi. 12, xiv. 14-16 (all the language in Rev. is figurative).

‡ E. L. Sukenik, *Ancient Synagogues in Palestine and Greece*, p. 34.

§ See A. R. Johnson in *The Labyrinth*, pp. 73 ff., for a convenient summary of the new views with an original approach.

nomist school and by the priests, the early documents were re-written in the light of later theory. But there is much in its favour. The origin of kingship was the desire of the Hebrews to have a King, "that we also may be like all the nations" (1 Samuel viii. 20). Consecration to kingship had a religious meaning. "Thou shalt be turned into another man," said Samuel to Saul (1 Sam. x. 6); and "God gave him another heart" (*v.* 9). The King in Babylonia and Egypt and elsewhere was "God's Son" in a special sense, and it was this kingship that Israel copied. Whatever sanctity attached to Saul was increased greatly when David captured Jerusalem and entered into the heritage of the priest-kings of that ancient city.*

Now in Babylonia on the fifth day of the New Year (Accession) festival the chief priest subjected the King to a ritual humiliation before Marduk (Bel). The rubric runs thus:—

"When he (the King) comes before Bel, the Urigallu-priest goes out. Sceptre, ring, divine weapons he (the priest) removes, his royal tiara he removes, brings them in before Bel, places them before Bel on a seat, goes out, strikes the King on the cheeks, . . . sits behind him, brings him in before Bel, draws him by his ears, makes him kneel on the ground. . . ." (The King then makes a protestation of innocence, such as is common in the Hebrew Psalms.)†

Something similar is thought to have taken place at Jerusalem. In Psalm lxxxix. the Davidic King is the Son of God: "I will also make him my first born" (*v.* 27)—as in Ps. ii. 7: "Thou art my son; this day have I begotten thee."‡ The court poet acknowledges that all Kings are "sons of God," but "David" is the "first-born, the highest of the Kings of the earth"; such a view of foreign Kings must be an importation from abroad. In *vv.* 38 ff. we have a humiliation of the King, for allowing which Yahweh is reproached.§ Note that in *vv.* 38, 39 the King is at once the Christ ("thine anointed") and the Servant of Yahweh.

Psalm xviii. is clearly composed for the Davidic King. It tells of his humbling and of deliverance from many waters, strong enemies, the day of calamity.‖

Psalm cxviii. is associated with the Feast of Tabernacles,

* Note the names *Absalom* and *Solomon*, taken from the name of the god *Salem* (Ass. *Shalmanu*), which comes apparently in Jeru*salem*.

† H. Gressmann, *Altorientalische Texte*, p. 302.

‡ So Marduk is said to have begotten Hammurabi. Cf. Gressmann, p. 99 (the choice of Tutmose III. by Amon): "He is my Father, I am his Son. He bade me be on his throne, when I was still a nestling. He hath begotten me."

§ If this psalm is a liturgy, the theory of a ritual humiliation is plausible. It is not easy to imagine a psalm written for a definite historical occasion coming into regular use in the Temple.

‖ Gunkel, *Die Psalmen*, p. 66, gives several parallels to *v.* 50.

which was combined with the New Year and Accession Festival.* Its liturgical purpose is unmistakable. The King is chastened, but not given over unto death. This ritual chastening takes place before the entrance into the gates of righteousness, *i.e.* of the Temple. The change in the King's fortunes is described as "the stone which the builders rejected is become the head of the corner."

In Psalm cx. we have a court poet addressing the King in an Egyptian or Assyrian style. The King is bidden to sit at the right hand of Yahweh, his enemies being made the foot-stool of his feet.† "My Lord" is a priest-king after the order of Melchisedek, an idea which must date from the early days of the monarchy, for in later times the idea of special holiness attaching to a Canaanite would not have been congenial.‡ Further evidence of the humiliation of the Messiah-King is perhaps afforded by Zechariah ix. 9, where "thy King cometh unto thee . . . lowly, and riding upon an ass."

When all reservations and deductions have been made, something remains which must be taken into account. The usual distinction, common in sermons even if it has disappeared from the books of scholars, between the Son of Man who came to serve and to suffer and the Conquering King of Jewish expectation, does not hold good. The three figures—the Son of Man, the Davidic King, and the Suffering Servant—merge into one another. The Son of Man is the Conqueror from heaven, though he remains man; something of Ezekiel's "son of man" seems to survive, indeed humanity can hardly fail to suggest some weakness and suffering. The King is traditionally associated with humiliation. As he *was* the State, and the Hebrews suffered so much, the association was inevitable, even if it had not been imitated from surrounding nations. And the King was the servant of Yahweh, so that no clear line divides him from Isaiah's Suffering Servant.

As we have said above, in post-exilic times monarchy was under a cloud, and the Old Testament writings were revised under the influence of new theories. But the "pattern" in ancient social life was very strong. If, as is perhaps best, we suppose that all knowledge of the ancient humiliation of the King was lost—though popular memory is tenacious—the documents remained and the liturgies were recited. So the qualities of the ideal King of the Psalms were transferred to the

* So Mowinckel and others; but Gunkel rejects this view.

† So the Egyptian King sits at the right hand of the god; and the Canaanite vassal in the Tell-el-Amarna Tablets calls himself Pharaoh's footstool (Gunkel, p. 482).

‡ David and Solomon blessed the people (2 Sam. vi. 18; 1 Kings viii. 14); interceded for the people (2 Sam. xxiv. 17; 1 Kings viii. 34); and offered sacrifice (2 Sam. vi. 13; 1 Kings iii. 4, etc.).

Messianic figure of the future. The features discussed above may have been neglected in popular estimation but they were not entirely lost. Jesus was able to reconcile in Himself the Son of Man, the Servant, and the King.

It is worth noticing that two of the psalms we have quoted were in Our Lord's mind during the last days at Jerusalem. "The stone which the builders rejected" is more significant if it was originally associated with the humbling of the Davidic King, and the interpretation of Psalm cx., where the priest-king after the manner of Melchisedek is bidden sit at God's right hand, is discussed in the same chapter.*

III

The anonymous writer of the Book of Daniel played a great part in the history of religion. Whatever traditional material he may have used, he formulated, or himself conceived, ideas which nerved the Jews to contend valiantly in their struggle against Antiochus, so vividly told in the Books of Maccabees. We are here concerned with the vision in chapter vii., in the interpretation of which we shall follow the guidance of R. H. Charles and J. A. Montgomery, the latest commentators in English. The four great beasts, representing heathen empires, have come up. Then

9. "I was seeing†
Till thrones were placed: and an Ancient sat;
His raiment white like snow: and the hair of his head
like pure wool;
His throne flames of fire: and its wheels burning fire.
10. A river of fire flowing: and coming forth from his
presence;
Thousands of thousands serving him: and myriad
myriads standing before him.
The court sat: and the books were opened."

The thrones are for the assessors of the Most High,‡ but only He takes His seat. The scene is the court of heaven as in 1 Kings xxii. 19: "I saw Yahweh sitting on his throne, and all the host of heaven standing by him, on his right hand and on his left." Daniel lifts his eyes from earth to heaven and learns God's judgment on the affairs of earth.

* Mark xii. 10, 36. Reflection on the meaning of such texts is so natural in Our Lord's mind that it is unnecessary to attribute it to the debates of the early Church, as is fashionable.

† Montgomery's translation.

‡ Cf. Ps. cxxii. 5: "For there are set thrones for judgment, the thrones of the house of David."

13. "I was seeing in the night visions,
And behold with the clouds of heaven: one like a man was coming,
And to the Ancient he came: and before Him he was presented."*

This "man" receives an everlasting dominion and a kingdom that shall not be destroyed. Then Daniel is given the interpretation of the vision. The four beasts are four kingdoms, but the Man is the Saints of the Most High, who will receive the Kingdom and possess it for ever.

Bar 'enāsh, Son of Man, is of course Aramaic for man. No stress is laid on *bar*; the idea of the idiom is that *'enāsh* is the *genus* to which the individual belongs. He is "like a man," that is he *is* man in the same sense as the lion and the bear are lion and bear, a representative and symbolic figure. But essentially he is an angelic being who champions and represents the faithful ones of Judæa; in his triumph the saints triumph. This interpretation is supported by Dan. viii. 15, 16, where the angel Gabriel stands in "the appearance of a man"; in ix. 21 we read of "the man Gabriel."†

The currents of eschatological thought flowed strongly in the two centuries following the Book of Daniel, until they culminated in the Christian Book of Revelation and the Jewish Apocalypse of Ezra (our 2 Esdras). The development may be summarized thus.‡

The prophets had no thought of a future life in a heavenly sphere. Eschatology as we know it originated outside Israel. The fragmentary hints found in the prophets were derived from Babylonia in pre-prophetical times and did not form the basis of the later apocalypses, the ideas of which came in later as a part of syncretism.

Eschatology was of two kinds. The one kind taught the coming of a Messiah who would set up a temporal rule in Palestine, re-establish the supremacy of Israel, and annihilate his enemies. The Messiah is human and dies like other men. In the other kind the antagonism was not between Jews and Gentiles but between God and the supernatural powers of evil; the Messiah is transcendental and has existed from before the Creation. The second type was really irreconcilable with the

* Dr. Charles seems to be wrong in denying the existence of a personal Son of Man in Dan. vii.

† The exact words in the Greek Bible are: Theodotion, *καὶ ἰδοὺ μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενος* (LXX, . . . *ὡς υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἤρχετο*); Mark xiii. 26, *ἐρχόμενον ἐν νεφέλαις*; Matt. xxiv. 30, *ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*; Luke xxi. 27 . . . *ἐν νεφέλῃ*; Mark xiv. 62 . . . *μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν*; Matt. xxvi. 64 . . . *ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν*.

‡ See Oesterley, *An Introduction to the Books of the Apocrypha*, pp. 56 ff.

first, but it contained elements of it, without which its teaching would not have won acceptance.

The following quotations from Enoch are arranged according to Dr. Charles' views of date.

1. *Pre-Maccabæan.*

xxv. 3: "This high mountain which thou hast seen, whose summit is like the throne of God, is His throne, where the Holy Great One, the Lord of Glory, the Eternal King, will sit, when He shall come down to visit the earth with goodness."*

lx. 2: "The Head of Days sat on the throne of His glory, and the angels and the righteous stood before Him."†

2. *105-64 B.C.*

xlv. 3: "On that day Mine Elect One shall sit on the throne of glory and shall try their works. . . .

4, 5: "Then will I cause Mine Elect One to dwell among them. And I will transform the heaven . . . and the earth."‡

xlvi. 1: "And I saw One who had a head of days, and His head was white like wool, and with Him was another being whose countenance had the appearance of a man, and His face was full of graciousness, like one of the holy angels.

2. "And I asked the angel who went with me and shewed me all the hidden things, concerning that Son of Man, who he was, and whence he was, and why he went with the Head of Days.

3. "And he answered and said unto me: This is the Son of Man who hath righteousness . . . (he shall raise up the righteous and put down the wicked)."

xlvii. 3: "In those days I saw the Head of Days when He seated Himself upon the throne of His glory, and the books of the living were opened before Him; and all His host which is in heaven above and His counsellors stood before Him. . . ."

xlviii. 2: "And at that hour the Son of Man was named in the presence of the Lord of Spirits, and his name before the Head of Days.

* God Himself comes, not an angelic being. The thought is that of Micah i. 3: "For, behold, Yahweh cometh forth out of his place, and will come down, and tread upon the high places of the earth." P. Volz, *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde*, p. 164, gives examples to shew that such coming of God was regarded as a second coming, the first being at creation, or on Sinai at the beginning of Hebrew history. Only the barest summary can be attempted in this section. Complete data will be found in Volz.

† In chapters lxxxiii.-xc. (165-161 B.C.) and lxxii.-lxxxii. (before 110 B.C.) there is nothing of importance for our purpose.

‡ One of many references to the new creation. That *Endzeit=Urzeit* was a maxim of eschatology. Cf. Gen. i. 1: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth"; Rev. xxi. 1: "I saw a new heaven and a new earth."

3. "Yea, before the sun and the signs were created, before the stars of the heaven were made, his name was named before the Lord of Spirits . . .

6. "And for this reason hath he been chosen and hidden before Him, before the creation of the world and for evermore."

li. 3: "And the Elect One shall in those days sit on My throne."

lxii. 5: ". . . when they see that Son of Man sitting on the throne of his glory."

7. "For from the beginning the Son of Man was hidden, and the Most High preserved him in the presence of His might, and revealed him to the elect."

lxix. 27: "And he sat on the throne of his glory, and the sum of judgment was given unto the Son of Man. . . ."

29. "For that Son of Man has appeared, and has seated himself on the throne of his glory. . . ."

3. *Chapters i.-v. (the latest part, but yet pre-Christian).*

i. 4: "The eternal God will tread upon the earth (even) on Mount Sinai . . . and appear in the strength of His might from the heaven of heavens."

9. "And behold! He cometh with ten thousands of His holy ones to execute judgment upon all, and to destroy all the ungodly."* God Himself comes and not the Son of Man—a reversion to older phraseology.†

Note that the Son of Man, or Elect One, judges in heaven on "the throne of his glory" (xlv. 3, lxii. 5)‡ and descends to earth only after heaven and earth have been transformed.

Of other passages from the Pseudepigrapha we select the following.

1. The Messianic King is an earthly ruler who will purge out the wicked and exalt Israel above the nations (Psalms of Solomon xvii. 23 to end). Ezra-Apocalypse (2 Esdras vii. 29): "After these years . . . my son the Messiah shall die, and all in whom there is human breath."§ Testament of Judah xxiv. 1: "And after these things shall a star arise to you from Jacob in peace, and a man shall arise from my seed like the sun of righteousness, walking with the sons of men in meekness and righteousness, and no sin shall be found in him."

2. An important passage in the Apocalypse of Baruch (xxx. 1) states: "And it shall come to pass after these things,

* The passage quoted in Jude 14, 15. † Micah i. 3, etc.

‡ Which is in heaven clearly, as in Dan. vii., which Enoch follows.

§ The translation, as throughout this section, is taken from Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha.*

when the time of the advent of the Messiah is fulfilled, that he shall return in glory" (*cum implebitur tempus adventus Messiæ, et redibit in gloria*). "This seems to mean that after his reign the Messiah will return in glory to heaven," says Dr. Charles.* But the context reads strangely. The Messiah does his work on earth, returns to heaven, and then in the following verses comes the Resurrection. It is tempting to connect the passage with the doctrine of the Primal Man (*Urmensch*), whose coming to earth to rule is thought of as a return. In any case, either "advent" (*parousia*) is used of the coming of the Messiah to heaven, or "return" is used of his first coming to earth. Ezra-Apocalypse (2 Esdras xiii. 3): "And I beheld, and lo! the wind caused to come up out of the heart of the seas as it were the form of a man. And I beheld, and lo! this Man flew with the clouds of heaven."

With the pre-existence of the Messiah may be compared that of the heavenly Jerusalem (Apocalypse of Baruch iv. 3), and even of Moses (Assumption of Moses i. 14). More important for future developments was the doctrine that Wisdom was present at the Creation (Wisd. ix. 9).

Orthodox Judaism finally repudiated the apocalypses, excepting the Book of Daniel, but the beliefs found in them are so strongly represented in the New Testament that we are safe in assuming that the circles in Palestine in which Messianic expectations flourished looked for a Messiah of the kind described above. That Jesus and His disciples studied written copies of Enoch and similar books need not be supposed, but clearly they provided raw material for the eschatology of the Gospels.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

(To be continued.)

MEMORANDUM ON SOME POINTS RECENTLY RAISED BY THE SOUTH INDIA SCHEME

Sent to a Correspondent in India, and read at a meeting of theologians at Oxford, on May 23, 1935, by the Warden of Keble College.

I. *Dispensation.*—I understand that the Metropolitan, in allowing congregations to receive the Holy Communion from a celebrant not episcopally ordained, relies upon the "power

* *Op. cit.*, ii. 498.

of dispensation" accorded to a Diocesan Bishop under Declaration 4 of the *Constitution of the Church of India, Burma, and Ceylon* (p. 15)—*i.e.*, "of suspending or modifying in special cases, if there seems to him good cause, the strict letter of the ecclesiastical law."

This power of dispensation was dealt with by the letter of the Regius Professor of Divinity and others to the Bishop of Colombo, of November 16, 1932; where, relying upon E. G. Wood, *The Regal Power of the Church*, § 9 (Abrogation of the Canon Law), they point out that *Ejusdem est solvere cujus est ligare*. The inferior cannot repeal the enactment of the superior; though a bishop or a parish priest may rule that, in certain cases, it does not apply. Thus, a sick man must by natural law have food convenient for him on a fast day, although the fast is required by ecclesiastical law. Such a dispensation is not a legislative but a judicial act, applying to a particular case. The law is not removed, but its operation is suspended. But a dispensation proper is a legislative act; and, to understand it, we must bear in mind another maxim: *Lex ligat, dispensatio solvit*. Such dispensation is a particular, limited, temporary removal of the obligation of a law. It is particular, because it affects one or more persons specially designated. It is limited, because the whole obligation may not be removed—the circumstances or conditions only requiring or justifying a partial removal. It is temporary, because when the circumstances alter, the dispensation ceases and the obligation revives: *cessante conditione, cessat ipsa dispensatio* (*ibid.*, 73).

Applying these principles to the permission given under the South India Scheme, for Anglicans to receive Communion at a service celebrated by a minister not episcopally ordained, it is clear that no dispensation, such as is known to the Catholic Church, can reach to the permission proposed. It is a "fundamental principle" (*Constitution* 7) of the Catholic Church that "to no person except a Bishop or a Priest is it committed or allowed to celebrate the Holy Eucharist"; and as the authority of the Church of India, Burma, and Ceylon is inferior to that of the Catholic Church, it has no power to grant such permission. Further, as proposed by the Scheme, the permission is not to affect persons specially designated, but congregations; and so is not particular, but general. And again, it is not necessarily to cease after the interim period of thirty years, and so is not temporary but likely to be permanent. In other words, the customs will become general and permanent; and the obligations of the law to the contrary will be not dispensed but destroyed. No dispensation can reach to the abrogation of the law.

II. Similar proposals and similar repudiation of them belong to the treatment of *Confirmation* under the Scheme.—(1) The law of the Catholic Church is that which is embodied in the rubric: "There shall none be admitted to Holy Communion, until such time as he be confirmed, or be ready and desirous to be confirmed." True, this has been alleged to be but a disciplinary requirement of the reformed Church of England; but it merely repeats the rubric of the Sarum Manual (W. Maskell, *Mon. Rit.*, i. 35 *seq.*), and the Constitution of Archbishop Peckham, in 1281 (J. Johnson, *Canons*, ii. 278); and the obligation runs back upon the place of Confirmation between Baptism and Communion in the whole rite of Christian Initiation; which gives the norm of Catholic Tradition in this matter both in East and West. It is true that in the Roman Catholic Church today Communion is often given before Confirmation, but always on the assumption that Confirmation will follow. If, then, Confirmation, or desire to be confirmed, is the necessary preliminary, or sequel, to Communion according to the law and practice of the Catholic Church, then no dispensation from it can cover its omission, if we are to hold to the rules of dispensation given above.

(2) The suggestion that Confirmation is not of importance is due to ignorance of its true nature. It is not something added to Baptism, but the complement of Baptism: and Baptism is therefore incomplete without it. Thus "Confirmation was in early days, from the New Testament onwards, not a separate sacrament to itself, but essentially one thing with the sacrament of Baptism. . . . What in the New Testament is called Baptism with the Spirit is nothing else than the gift of the Spirit imparted through the laying-on of hands that accompanied Baptism: and in the only ancient treatise that touches specifically on the distinction between the two rites they are correlated as *baptisma aquæ* and *baptisma Spiritus*." So Dr. Turner, in *Catholic and Apostolic*, 140, referring to the *De Rebaptismate*, *c.* 10, an African treatise of *c.* 256 (ap. Cyprian, op. iii. 82, ed. Harnack). Baptism commonly meant at that date Baptism and Confirmation regarded as two moments in a single action, as in Cyprian, *Ep.* lxiii., § 8 (Per baptisma autem Spiritus sanctus accipitur, et sic baptizatis et Spiritum sanctum consecutis ad bibendum calicem Domini pervenitur, ed. Harnack, ii. 707). It was only when it was necessary to distinguish them, as in the discussions of heretical baptisms, that they were distinguished, and such a phrase as "utrumque sacramentum" was used (Cyprian, *Epp.* lxxii. § 1, and lxxiii. § 21). This tradition that Baptism and Confirmation are two parts of one rite is observable in the prayer for the Septiform Spirit, which accom-

panied the laying-on of hands in the *Gelasian Sacramentary* of the seventh century (ed. A. H. Wilson, 87); and is no less clear from the original use of *confirmare* to mean not "to strengthen" but to "confirm." Thus, in the *Ordo Romanus* I., § 20, the Archdeacon of Rome is to "confirm" the communion of the Faithful by administering the Chalice to those whom the Pope has communicated with the Host (ed. C. Atchley, 142); and according to Isidore of Seville († 636), the phrase "Confirmatio sacramenti" was used in Spain to denote the invocation of the Holy Spirit in the Mass as completing the mystery (*De eccl. off.* I., xv., § 3). But, later on, a new sense was attached to "Confirmation," when it was taken to mean "strengthening," as by St. Thomas Aquinas (*cf.* "robur spirituale," *Summa* III., q. lxxii., art. 2); relying, in all good faith, on a spurious letter of Pope Melchiades, 311-†314 (*ibid.*, art. 1), included in the Forged Decretals of *c.* 845. Hence the later doctrine of the Western Church—our own included—that it is a distinct sacrament ("speciale sacramentum," q. lxxii., art. 1), conferring an increase of strength (augmentum . . . ad pugnam, *ibid.*) proper to growing years. The original meaning of Confirmation and its original connection with the Baptism seem thus to have entirely escaped the Bishops of the Lambeth Conference. They appear to have been unaware that Confirmation is the complement of Baptism, and Baptism therefore incomplete without it. They have consequently failed explicitly to include it in the Sacrament of Baptism, as part of one of the two sacraments universally necessary to salvation, where they may be had; and so have left the way open to the authors of the South Indian Scheme to leave it optional, and to treat it merely as one among other edifying rites leading to full membership of the Church. Wesleyans, Congregationalists and others of the uniting bodies are ready enough to do this, because Confirmation occupies no greater position among Protestants. Thus, to take a typically Lutheran service such as that given in *The Swedish Rite*, edited by E. E. Yelverton (p. 104 *seq.*). It is conducted by the parish minister; merely announces that the recipients now have the right to communicate; and omits the laying-on of hands and the enumeration of the Sevenfold Gift of the Holy Spirit. Calvin went further, and discarded the whole thing on the ground that, as miracles ceased with the Apostolic age, the laying-on of hands passed away with the miraculous signs that accompanied it (*Inst.* IV., xix. 6). Why, then, should the Church of India, Burma, and Ceylon, "being" as it is (according to its *Constitution*, p. 7) "a part of the one holy catholic and Apostolic Church," give way to proposals which have their root in traditions of non-Catholic origin?"

III. We pass on next to the claim that a presbyter should take part in the consecration of a Bishop. This is a claim prompted by the same tradition, which runs back upon Calvin's doctrine of the ministry. Starting from the assumption that the only Church polity is that which is laid down in Eph. iv. 11, he dismissed Apostles, Prophets, and Evangelists as intended by God only for the beginning of His Kingdom; except in so far as an apostle was necessary in Calvin's own day to bring back the Church, as Moses recovered Israel from Egyptian darkness, from Anti-Christ to Christ Himself. Leaving thus a loophole for the validity of his own call, he held that Pastors and Doctors were the only ministers in perpetuity. Further, there is but a nominal distinction, he said, between bishops, presbyters, pastors, and ministers. "Duo autem sunt quæ perpetuo manent: gubernatio et cura pauperum. Gubernatores fuisse existimo seniores e plebe delectos, qui censuræ morum et exercendæ disciplinæ una cum episcopis præessent" (*Inst.* IV., iii. 8). Omitting the elder as thus a disciplinary officer, a parity of ministers as between bishop and presbyter is the outstanding mark of the presbyterian policy; and it is to exhibit this parity that the presbyter is now to be allowed to join in the consecration of a Bishop.

But in the Pastoral Epistles there is a clearly marked distinction between the office of the bishop (*διὰ τῆς ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν μου*, 2 Tim. i. 6) and the function of the presbyter (*μετὰ ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν τοῦ πρεσβυτερίου*, 1 Tim. iv. 14) at the laying-on of hands in ordination. The presbyters merely do so, as consenting to the promotion of the presbyter now being ordained to their own Order by the bishop; and this is the consistent meaning of the language used of presbyters in the Ordinals—viz., that they are not the equals of the bishop but his assistants. Thus, in the prayer *Deus honorum omnium* of the sixth century or earlier, which is the "form" of the rite for the ordination of a presbyter, their relation to the bishop is compared with that of the Seventy to Moses, and the bishop prays: "Da quæsumus, Pater, in hos famulos tuos presbyterii dignitatem. Innova in visceribus eorum spiritum sanctitatis. Acceptum a te, Deus, secundi meriti munus obtineant . . . Sint probi co-operatores ordinis nostri" (*Sacr. Leon*, p. 122, ed. C. L. Feltoe). In the older and as yet earliest known ordinal, *c.* 225, of *The Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus there is a marked difference between the function of the presbyters at the ordination of a bishop, and their privilege at the ordination of presbyters. On the former occasion, "Episcopus ordinetur electus ab omni populo; quique, cum nominatus fuerit et placuerit omnibus, conveniet populum una cum presbyteris

et his qui praesentes fuerint episcopi, die dominica. Consentientibus omnibus, imponant super eum manus: et presbyterium adstet quiescens. Omnes autem silentium habeant, orantes in corde propter descensionem Spiritus: ex quibus unus de praesentibus episcopis ab omnibus rogatus, imponens manus ei qui ordinatur episcopus, oret ita dicens . . ." (L. Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, 526). On the latter occasion: "Cum autem presbyter ordinatur, imponat manum super caput ejus episcopus, contingentibus etiam presbyteris, et dicat . . ." (*ibid.*, 530). "A presbyter," as Dr. Brightman comments, "is ordained by the bishop, who imposes his hand and recites the prayer of ordination, the existing presbyters joining with him in the imposition of hands. This co-operation, it is explained, does not import that the presbyters have authority to ordain: they impose their hands because they share 'the common Spirit' who is invoked upon the ordinand, and thereby they set their seal to the act of the ordaining bishop" (*Early Hist. Ch. and Min.*, 400 *seq.*, ed. H. B. Swete). Clearly the bishop is related to the presbyter as superior to inferior; and, if the presbyter cannot ordain his equals, much less his superior: for without any dispute the less is blessed by the greater (Heb. vii. 7), not the greater by the less.

IV. Finally, this relation of bishop to presbyter as of superior to inferior followed upon the fundamental conception of the office of a bishop, and helps to explain why it is that, for a valid eucharist, it should be ministered by a priest, while baptism may be validly ministered, in case of necessity, by a layman. The principle is that originally the bishop, as *summus sacerdos* (Tert., *De baptismo*, *c.* 17), "has plenary competence in respect of the Sacraments, and is the normal minister of them all" (Swete, *op. cit.*, 381); and it is only a question how far he found it necessary to delegate them. With the expansion of the Church, he had to delegate most of them—Mass and Penance, with other responsibilities such as preaching—to the parish priest: baptism, since of the two sacraments necessary to salvation it was the more necessary as the title to the rest, he had to delegate even to laymen; but one sacrament the bishop never delegated, viz., Ordination: nor, absolutely, Confirmation because, if not personally ministered by him, it could only be ministered with chrism which he had consecrated. "Generally speaking, it may be said that all liturgical ceremonies are by right the privilege of the episcopate who possess the fulness of the priesthood. Originally all the sacraments were administered by the bishop or by delegates chosen by him and acting in close conjunction with him. . . . But, in course of time, the episcopate, without laying down in any way its supreme

authority, allowed the priesthood to become the ordinary ministers for the due performance of certain sacramental rites. Other rites, on the contrary, have been reserved for the plenary sacerdotal powers of the bishop" (*The Roman Pontifical*, by Dom Pierre de Puniet, 70). It is not the case that such powers belonged indifferently to the members of the Church and then were concentrated upon, or monopolized by, the priesthood. It is the other way round: the authority belonged originally to the bishop, and he never delegated the right to celebrate the Eucharist to any minister below the rank of a priest. The question, therefore, is not "Why can a priest alone consecrate the Eucharist?" but "How came it about that any sacrament can be celebrated by anyone but the bishop?"

If this be the theory of the episcopate, as underlying the practice of the Church from the beginning, under no circumstances can Catholics consent to receive the sacraments from, or to remain in communion with, a ministry constituted on other principles. These principles are such as are involved in three theories of the ministry now offered to us:

(1) The theory of a parity of ministers, as developed in presbyterianism.

(2) The theory of the equal validity of existing ministries, as set forth in a "Memorandum on the Status of the existing Free Church Ministry put forth at Lambeth on July 6, 1923" to the effect that "the ministries which imply a sincere intention to preach Christ's Word and administer the Sacraments as Christ has ordained, and to which authority so to do has been solemnly given by the Church concerned, are real ministries of Christ's Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church . . . though in varying degrees irregular or defective" (G. K. A. Bell, *Documents on Christian Unity*, 159). But this theory has not yet been endorsed by the Anglican Communion; and it either goes too far or not far enough. Too far, because only ministries standing in the Apostolic Succession are valid on the Catholic reading of history. Or not far enough; for, if this is true of the ministries of the Free Churches, why not invite them at once to celebrate the Holy Communion at our altars? What have irregularity or defect to do with the matter if they are valid and so great a cause as Christian re-union is at stake?

(3) The theory of the Bishop of Gloucester that Order is valid by "whomsoever conferred, provided only that it is given by means of the imposition of hands with prayer" (*Bampton Lectures*, 311 *seq.*). In other words, valid Orders are to be equated with valid baptism; and only the proper ministration, not the proper minister, is necessary to the sacrament.

But Catholics can never consent to a union built upon the abandonment of the Catholic Ministry; and if the Episcopate is only to survive, at option, as a convenient or historic form of government, then there is as much to be said, perhaps more, for governmental efficiency, in favour of presbyterianism or papacy. Further, the Historic Episcopate, merely as a method of Church government, could scarcely be called historic (Stubbs, *Visitation Charges*, p. 130).

I cannot forbear to quote, in conclusion, the warning given by Bishop Gore at the Church Congress at Cambridge in 1910; a warning immediately confirmed by Dr. Sanday: "The Anglican communion would certainly be rent in twain on the day on which any non-episcopally ordained minister was formally allowed within our communion to celebrate the Eucharist, and any Colonial Church of our communion which recognized in this way the validity of non-episcopal Orders would either be disowned by other parts of the Anglican communion or, if that were not the case, would . . . cause a division within our communion at home."

B. J. KIDD, D.D.

THE LIFE AND OPINIONS OF BENJAMIN WHICHCOTE

I

BENJAMIN WHICHCOTE was the most celebrated preacher in Cambridge, from the death of Laud until the Restoration. He was leader of the Cambridge Platonists, who enlightened the University by teaching Christian Humanism. The home of this movement was Emmanuel College, which was noted for its excellent scholars and puritan traditions. But Whichcote and his friends parted from these traditions. They disliked puritan dogmatism, and sought to sweeten religion with the temper of philosophy.

They enjoyed the doubtful privilege of a scholastic education.* They may have known sufficient of the work of Bacon to dislike his careful separation of religion and reason. They had read the writings of Descartes with qualified approval; perhaps in his sunlit philosophy they felt the coming chill of atheism. They studied Hobbes, and opposed his unbelief. They rejected his doctrine that men were controlled by interest

* "An asinine feast of sow-thistles and brambles."—Milton, *Tractate on Education*, 1644.

and fear, and asserted their responsibility to the eternal principles of Right and Wrong.

Thus they were opposed to dogmatism in religion and atheism in philosophy. And the driving power behind their opposition was Platonism.* Plotinus was studied at Cambridge in 1633, and perhaps a little earlier. He brought new life to the puritan scholars of Emmanuel. They remained faithful to their bibles and, for the most part, to the liturgy and articles of the Church of England. But they could not forget that they had learnt the value of reason from Plato and Plotinus; and the use of it transformed their religion.

II

In the year 1651, Doctor Tuckney was Master of Emmanuel. In September of that year he wrote to Doctor Whichcote, his old pupil, and at that time Provost of King's College and Vice-Chancellor of the University, to complain of the emphasis on reason in his sermons. The correspondence which followed may still be read with pleasure, in parts; and lurking between the arguments on Faith and Grace are some facts about Whichcote.

His boyhood was passed in the parish of Burford in the south-east corner of Shropshire. In this parish, one and a quarter miles apart, were situated the farms of Stoke and Greet. In 1587 their owner was George Fox, Esq., and he died in that year, before realizing that he would be the grandfather of Benjamin Whichcote. Shortly after his death, the Whichcotes, coming perhaps from the ancient family of that name living at Harpeswell in Lincolnshire, captured part of his estate, and his daughter. Stoke House and its adjoining lands cost them £1,225. This house is situated on a hill, commanding a view to the south of the rising slopes of Herefordshire, and to the west of the hills of Wales. At present the back of the house is said to retain some features of the Whichcote residence, and on the front is a dial bearing the date 1702, when the family was still there. Here, about 1597, Christopher Whichcote carried his wife Elizabeth, from the neighbouring family at Greet; and in 1609 their son Benjamin was born. They took him to be baptized at Burford parish church. The ceremony over, the following entry was made in the parish register:

Mar. 15. Beniamin, s. Christopher Whitchcott, gent., & Elizabeth his w. b.

Such excursions were familiar: Benjamin was their tenth child.

He grew up amid rural solitude and puritan traditions; but

* Including Neo-platonism. The Cambridge Platonists did not distinguish between them.

when he was eleven his father died. His mother, still vigorous, removed with some of her children to Shrewsbury, where she survived her husband forty-six years. She did not die till Whichcote had come and gone as Provost of King's, and all her twelve children were either dead or turned fifty. She now shares with her grand-daughter a flat stone against the south wall of St. Julian's Church.* Whether Whichcote went with her to Shrewsbury we do not know. At any rate, he did not accompany his younger brother Jeremy to Shrewsbury School. And we next find him, in 1626, entering Emmanuel as a pensioner, paying his own expenses without grant or scholarship. His tutor was Dr. Tuckney. In 1633 he was elected Fellow of his college. In 1636 he was ordained both deacon and priest, and appointed Sunday afternoon lecturer at Trinity Church; where he preached Reason with such persistence that in his letters Tuckney complains of his "so large discourse about it," which was "but the fourth edition of what many of them had heard before."†

The early relations of tutor and pupil must have been exemplary:

> "Sir, for yourself; from your first coming to Cambridge, I truly said, I loved you: as finding you then studious and pious, and very loving and observant of me. I remember, I then thought you somewhat cloudy and obscure in your expressions: but then I left you."‡

During Tuckney's absence from Cambridge (1627-1644), his news of his pupil caused him some misgiving:

> "I have heard; that, when you came to be Lecturer in the college, you in a great measure for the year laid aside other studies; and betook yourself to Philosophy and Metaphysics: which, some think, you were then so immersed in; that ever since you have been cast into that mould, both in your private discourse, and preaching. . . . Whilst you were Fellow here, you were cast into the company of very learned and ingenious men; who, I fear, at least some of them, studied other authors more than Scriptures; and Plato and his scholars above others."§

Not only the Fellows of Emmanuel, but the undergraduates, were infected by this taste for Greek philosophy. For Whichcote—

> "set young students much on reading the ancient philosophers; chiefly Plato, Tully, and Plotinus."‖

* Owen and Blakeway, *History of Shrewsbury*, ii., p. 436, and foot-note.
† *Letters between Tuckney and Whichcote*, p. 20.
‡ *Letters*, p. 36. § *Letters*, pp. 36-38.
‖ *Burnet*, p. 44 (Everyman).

And he had some able pupils. Among them were John Worthington, afterwards Master of Jesus, and John Smith, whose Discourses are perhaps the most attractive of all the writings of the Cambridge Platonists. A pleasant anecdote of Whichcote's affection for his friends probably belongs to this period. He was "once in conversation with Sterry on some obscure points in Divinity," when "he explained himself with such ease and clearness that the doctor, rising from his seat and embracing him, exclaimed: 'Peter, thou hast overcome me; thou art all pure intellect.'"*

He never regretted this time spent on secular reading.

> "The time I have spent in Philosophers, I have no cause to repent of; and the use I have made of them, I dare not disown: . . . I find the Philosophers that I have read, good; so far as they go: and it makes me secretly blush before God, when I find either my head, heart or life challenged by them."†

Nevertheless, he selected with care:

> "In reading Heathen authors, I have affected to imitate the Bee; rather than the Spider."‡

He also read some scholastic writers; though he asserts that between 1637 and 1651 he had not spent twenty-four hours on them. To this Tuckney could only reply that a surprising number of their phrases found their way into his sermons, and he must conclude:

> "That either those few hours of your converse with them made a very deep impression in you, moulding you much that way; or, as *nascitur non fit poeta*, that the natural frame of your head was much in that channel."§

Clearly the kind of thing a tutor ought to know. But whatever Whichcote may have read, he did not pass for an accomplished scholar. And we may trust his own assertion:

> "I have not read many books; but I have studied a few: meditation and invention have been rather my life, than reading."‖

In 1641 he was an unsuccessful candidate for the Gresham Professorship of Divinity. Two years later he married Mrs. Craddock, widow of the Governor of Massachusetts. We know little of this lady save that she once told her husband "how

* Preface to Vol. II. of Sterry's sermons, "The Rise, Race, and Royalty of the Kingdom of God."

† *Letters*, p. 60.

‡ *Letters*, p. 128.

§ *Letters*, p. 80.

‖ *Letters*, p. 54.

much she was revived" by one of Tuckney's excellent sermons. About the same time he retired to North Cadbury in Somerset, a living presented to him by the College. He was wise, for there was no joy in Cambridge. A puritan garrison had already been stationed there a year. And in January, 1643, Parliament commissioned the Earl of Manchester to examine "all provosts, masters, and fellows of colledges, all students and members of the University," to eject whomsoever he wished, to sequester their estates and revenues, and appoint successors. In December his forerunner, John Dowson, was taking down pictures and smashing windows. But the puritan soldiery had ceased to exercise themselves in King's Chapel when Whichcote was appointed Provost in 1644, in succession to Dr. Collins. He respected his predecessor and probably thought the alteration irregular. The arguments by which his scruples yielded to his duty may still be seen. He insisted that Dr. Collins should receive half the stipend of the Provostship. He helped to redeem the sequestered property of George Heath, an ejected Fellow of Corpus Christi. And next year Dr. Holdsworth, the ejected Master of Emmanuel, wrote to his "much esteemed friend," Whichcote, offering to surrender a portion of his library, to give his furniture to his successor, and to make good the college plate he had sent away, probably for the support of Charles I. Dr. Holdsworth was generous. He was in the Tower. Whichcote was the only one of the newly appointed Heads who refused to take the Covenant, and Tillotson says that the greater part of the Fellows of King's were exempted through his intercession. At the same time, Tuckney returned to Emmanuel as Master, and two puritan divines, Arrowsmith and Hill, were made Master of St. John's and Trinity respectively:

> "And thus four very intimate Friends, after a separation of some years, saw each other again, in the several most honourable stations in the University." *

This fair puritan sky was soon clouded by the opinions of Whichcote. Youngest but most influential of the four, his views had changed within the last twelve years; he had parted from the puritan tradition, and was actively propagating his characteristic doctrines. The young Masters of Arts hankered after this new teaching. His friends opposed him with their authority, but stifled their private discontent; until in 1651 it broke out in Tuckney's letter which we have already noticed. After this happy but ill-fated reunion Whichcote resigned his Somersetshire living. But his new college presented him to the

* Preface to *Letters*, p. xx.

living of Milton in Cambridgeshire. In 1649 he was created Doctor of Divinity at a cost of £40 0s. 6d., though half of this was needed to provide a supper for the college.* A year later, Worthington, who had been one of his pupils at Emmanuel, and whom he had helped to a disputed fellowship, consulted him as to whether he should accept the proffered Mastership of Jesus. Worthington kept a diary, and married Whichcote's niece. The Mistress of Jesus College was seventeen. But we have to thank her husband for much information about "Uncle Provost," who performed the ceremony.

Whichcote's fame steadily increased. In 1651 he was Vice-Chancellor. He contributed to a volume of Latin verses dedicated to Cromwell on the occasion of peace with Holland. He was invited in 1655 to advise him on the toleration of the Jews. The Protector lamented the disagreement of his advisers and requested their prayers; but the Jews did not benefit. When he died there were more "excellent hexameters" from the "high-minded Provost of King's," whose sincerity shamed the flatteries of other contributors.† In 1659 he combined with Tuckney and others in supporting Matthew Poole's scheme for maintaining poor students of "choice ability" at the University. In the matter of theology his breach with Tuckney was never healed. But he helped to elect him to the Regius Professorship, and their relations remained friendly till both lost their places at the Restoration.

> [Tuckney] "took his short warning, receded from Cambridge and lived private and retired in London; till the Plague, the Fire, and the Five Mile Act drove him out of the great City."‡

Whichcote tried to retain his Provostship. To this end, he wrote to Lord Lauderdale; but an encouraging reply was all he could obtain. And the king's hand, which he kissed in June, turned him out in July. If His Majesty did not remember that

* MS. Harl. No. 7,045, p. 477. Expensæ circa gradum doctoratus in s. theologia Dec. 9, 1648. From Dr. Whichcote's paper-book:

Imprimis, creation fee to the prof.	pd. Dec. 9.	01	04	06
Item, groates to the doctors,	pd. Dec. 9	00	05	00
Admission to the proctors	pd. Dec. 11.	02	05	08
Composition,	pd Dec 11.	08	06	04
To the College	pd. Dec 14	04	00	00
To the professors man	pd. Feb. 16.	00	05	00
Supper Feb 22., for the act		20	00	00
The cookes man		00	05	00
Exceedings in the college	pd. Maii 16	03	06	00
Determ. bedell 1sh. sch. keeper 2sh	Maii 28.	00	03	00
		40	00	06

† J. B. Mullinger, *Univ. of Cambridge*, iii., p. 517.
‡ Preface to *Letters*, p. x.

Whichcote had never been elected Fellow, and therefore could not legally be Provost, of King's, the information was supplied by his chaplain, Dr. Fleetwood, who wanted the place. The college was sorry to see him go. "He had been an encourager of learning and virtue," wrote one of the senior Fellows; "had never persecuted any of us on difference of opinion, and had deserved well of the whole society." In August he heard of the dismissal of Dr. Worthington, who retired, a poor man, to his living at Fen Ditton, near Cambridge. In September he arranged that Worthington should have a small estate of his, three miles beyond Newmarket, in exchange for a half-share in some land near Chesterton which had proved difficult to manage. The rector of Fen Ditton was grateful. The estate brought a rent of £45 per annum, and a tenant who could well afford to pay it. But Whichcote's kindness did not end there. In January he arranged that his nephew Paul should go to Fen Ditton for tuition between leaving school and entering the University. Thirty pounds per annum which he brought for "diet and teaching" was welcome to Worthington, who could well spare "quarter of an hour in the morning and another in the afternoon to instruct him."* At the same time Whichcote complains of "his old infirmity" on account of which "I shall not stir abroad this month so I cannot act for Mr. Hartlib as I would."† Samuel Hartlib was the friend of Milton, Pepys, and Boyle; he spent his patrimony in public works, in helping poor scholars, and in sending books to his friends. He was often in need of money, and Whichcote had been generous. Once there was a fire in his room:

> "Many of my things were spoiled. I could wish Dr. Whichcote knew. I have few such friends as he hath been in my distressed condition."‡

In October, 1661, Whichcote took a house in Bednal Green. And he was suffering from the quartan ague, a fever whose paroxysms recurred every four days. In the following February he went to Cambridge, and Worthington noticed that his ague had shaken him. Many remedies were suggested, but he thought it best to wait patiently till the spring, when the trouble would normally disappear. In November, 1662, having complied with the Act of Uniformity, he was elected to the cure of Blackfriars. But the Fire destroyed his church.

> "Blackfriars church (that had no steeple) is so buried in the heaps that the old clerk who hath been there forty years could not discern where the church had stood."§

* Worthington's *Diary*, i., p. 260.
† *Diary*, i., p. 260.
‡ *Diary*, ii., pp. 107 and 62.
§ *Diary*, ii., p. 212.

He retired to his living at Milton. He had friends in Cambridge, among whom was the Master of Christ's, Dr. Cudworth. But his niece could no longer welcome him to the rectory of Fen Ditton. For in 1663 Worthington had been displaced. Whichcote stood by him for three difficult years, until Worthington lost his church, his house, and part of his goods in the Fire. He was subsequently offered the living of Ingoldsby in Lincolnshire and Whichcote urged him to take it. On May 14, 1667, he wrote to the rector of Ingoldsby:

> "I have received yours of May 3rd, and am glad that you are at length come to that which is your own—a certainty and legal settlement. Other things, as the world goes, are but imaginary, insignificant. This you may hold (as a place of being in this world, and some opportunity of service) till you see true cause and reason to remove. If there be not as good advantages for converse as you may desire, it may be in part supplied by journeys abroad, excursions, and temporary absence. I have seen your books at Ditton, in the granary: they are safe, and undertaken to be so continued. Bishop Wren was interred last Saturday, in the vault by himself prepared in his new chapel in Pembroke hall. Dr. Pearson made a speech. Regents and non-regents had sugar-boxes. I have, since Michaelmas last, married away three of my four servants, and the fourth is upon the point of being married. This trade goes on though all others at a stand."*

Three months elapsed and he was again in Cambridge. Perhaps he rejoiced with the Master of Christ's that their friend was at last settled. In the first few days of August they heard of the birth of Worthington's fourth daughter; a week later, that his wife was dead. Worthington, heartbroken, writes to "his honoured uncle, Dr. Whichcote":

> "I fear I was not so thankful for her as I ought. God cut her off in the flower of her age, being twenty-seven years old and twelve days. Young she was, but *matura cælo*. . . . After sermon our little one was baptized. God make her like her mother in the best things, as she is in her little age not unlike her."†

Whichcote lived at Milton for another year, during which—

> "he preached constantly, relieved the poor, had their children taught to read at his own charge, and made up differences among the neighbours."‡

* *Diary*, ii., p. 228. † *Diary*, ii., p. 234. ‡ Tillotson, *Funeral Sermon*.

But in 1668 he went to London, to the vicarage of St. Lawrence Jewry. The rebuilding of his church which had been destroyed by the Fire occupied seven years, during which time he preached regularly before the corporation at Guildhall Chapel. In 1671 he lost Worthington, who had found Ingoldsby unbearable without his wife, and had settled in London "for friends and books." In 1674 he combined with Tillotson, Stillingfleet, and certain nonconformists, to extend education in Wales. He was entrusted by William Larkin with £1,000 "to dispose of to pious uses at his own discretion"; with this money he founded scholarships at Emmanuel. The libraries of King's and Emmanuel profited by his generosity. In 1683 he visited Dr. Cudworth, and took the cold from which he died. The Master of Christ's could no longer send his "affectionate respects to father Whichcote."*

Whichcote's fame rested on his preaching—especially at Cambridge—and on his influence on younger men. In his day Cambridge was thick with sermons. Tuckney remarks that the Gospel was "nowhere so freely preached, and so absolutely without charge to any, as then at Cambridge." And Tillotson, who was then an undergraduate, usually heard four sermons each Sunday. *Sic itur ad astra.* We can now read ninety-seven of Whichcote's discourses, together with twelve hundred aphorisms, collected from his notes, and a small book of "Select Notions." He published nothing during his life. He appears to have preached from incomplete and badly written notes; and Dr. Salter, his cheerful eighteenth-century editor, thinks that such sermons as we have were probably taken down by his pupils and admirers. The reader will certainly find them rather disjointed. As compared with Donne's, they lack both beauty and order. But Whichcote knew what he wanted to say, and said it well enough to capture the young men of his time, and to hold the attention of all who maintained that Christian doctrines may be founded in Reason.

III

Whichcote held that the human mind† resembles God and can therefore know Him. On this affinity between God and the mind he rested his philosophy.

Thus the human mind could grope for God and feel an "intellectual touch" of Him. Many philosophers, writing

* *Diary*, ii., p. 153.

† It is difficult to distinguish between the meaning of "mind" and "soul" as used by Whichcote. The first term has been selected, since it draws attention to his emphasis on reason.

before Christ, had been aware of this experience. To account for it, and to solve the problems of man's destiny, they had developed the theory of natural religion. This theory provided a map of that eternal world which the Platonists held to exist behind all temporal phenomena. But Christians were not wholly dependent on this map. For Revelation had provided a picture of the eternal world in the life of Christ. This picture they found in the biblical records, and to see that it was genuine they could compare it with their map.

To form this map Whichcote drew his material from introspection and the observation of others. He drew little evidence from the material world, though he taught that its existence and support required the existence of God. But his insight into human nature made him a powerful preacher; and Smith learnt from Whichcote that the place to find God was within his own mind.

He assumed that man has freedom and the power of moral choice. Plotinus had said that the mind would find its own level, and would choose those spiritual things to which it was akin. The good man will love goodness, and the merciful will love mercy. In this power of choice the problem of evil is rooted. Man is free to turn away from God and follow his own desires, and this is sin.

His life should be controlled by reason. This faculty in man resembles God's Reason and can therefore be relied upon to shew us our way in God's Creation. The Divine Reason has established certain principles of order—laws of nature in the material world; the law of love in the spiritual. And human reason is a God-like faculty by which we recognize those laws. Thus, it becomes a form of spiritual experience—the Spirit of God working in the mind of man, exposing the pattern of His Creation and teaching us our way about it.

But man's reason is stained or illuminated by vice or virtue. Reason and goodness grow together in the mind; the knowledge of virtue should bring love, and the love of it increasing knowledge. In assuming that the mind was like God, and therefore had a natural affection for goodness, the Cambridge Platonists scarcely considered the painful situation of the man who knew, but could not follow, virtue. For them knowledge and affection were simultaneous.

When reason and virtue are followed in sincerity there is "fair weather" in the mind. Man is made to know God, and in the quest for Him he finds peace. This spiritual quiet is the joy of religion; it is proof against all evils from without. A good man has heaven within him—heaven, which is "first a temper, then a place." Hell also is a state of the mind. Sin

brings its own punishment in remorse of conscience and mental disquiet. But when the sinner repents, God's mercy breaks upon him and he loses his anxiety; as a man on the hills coming out of the mist sees the land below him like a tapestry spread in the sunlight. This quiet temper is characteristic of religion. To secure it, man must practise restraint, and only let himself go in spirit towards God. Physical restraint is the condition of spiritual release. Man is made to know God and is unhappy without Him.

He is also unhappy if he is quarrelling with his neighbour. The social virtues are love and friendly toleration. Every man has certain disadvantages for which he is not responsible, and which must be patiently accepted by himself and others. He should be neither bullied nor compelled; persuasion alone can win the allegiance of a rational being. The kindest thing we can do is to shew him his faults and to give him fair opportunity to mend his ways. From this analysis of human nature Whichcote made his map of natural religion.

He also drew his doctrine from the Revelation of God in the biblical record. Its witness to spiritual facts, such as God's love for man, was reliable. A stranger to biblical criticism, the lapse of time between Moses and Christ meant as little to him as the five hundred years which separated Plato and Plotinus. He went to the Bible looking for religion; and the problems raised by its literary history did not occur to him.

But this need not make his work unacceptable. The lack of critical technique need not handicap a preacher whose main interest is religion. Some entertainment may be found in Whichcote's explanation of awkward passages. For instance, Uzzah, who put out his hand and touched the ark to save it falling from the waggon, was struck dead; since the divine law was recent which declared the ark inviolate, and the first offender must be signally punished. The reader of these sermons will not be averse to gathering what humour he can find by the way.

Perhaps it was the moral element in the Gospel which made the strongest appeal to Whichcote. Like all the Cambridge Platonists, he asserted that Right and Wrong were eternal principles; and that virtue was natural to man, and vice unnatural. But he did not distinguish, as Butler did, between an *a priori* moral science and morality grounded in the analysis of human nature. This confusion overcasts his work. It was partly due to Hobbes, who himself started from such an analysis. The Cambridge Platonists, disliking his conclusions, too easily rejected his method. They felt the storm, and took shelter in metaphysics. But Whichcote was too practical to be happy there. He often used a method as congenial to him-

self as to Hobbes. He analyzed human nature, asserted the supremacy of reason, and thus foreshadowed the position which was afterwards clearly developed by Butler. Further, he appealed, not unsuccessfully, to the pagan philosophers. But the firmest ground of his moral opinions was the historical revelation of God in the life of Christ.

His treatment of the doctrine of forgiveness of sin will illustrate the way he handled Revelation. We are told in the Bible that God forgives sin; and Whichcote set out to shew that belief in this forgiveness was not unreasonable. First, it tallied with our natural notions of God. If He is good, then He must shew mercy. Man could not speculate how this might be done, but when the way of redemption through Christ was revealed, he was bound to admit that the act of redemption was characteristic of God, and that He alone could choose the means. Thus, a belief in the fact that such means had been used is not excluded by reason. To support this main position he brought up two further arguments. He pointed out that men themselves occasionally forgive their enemies; and since God loved more deeply than they, He would be more merciful. Further, Revelation apart, forgiveness following on repentance was the best way of dealing with rational men. It was unwise to force a man whom you could persuade. And God would more certainly win the allegiance of men through their repentance and His forgiveness, than by the multiplication of calamities.

In doctrine and in ritual Whichcote was not keen on straining at texts. He thought all that was necessary for salvation was clearly stated in the Bible; but these necessities were confined to the love and worship of God and Christ, and the love and just treatment of our neighbours. Many matters in religion had been left for man's reason to decide. When we lived by love of God and by reason, there could be no gain in loading the memory with precepts. These opinions conflicted with those of his contemporaries. He was loved or hated mainly for his toleration. Tuckney could not read with approval that "the maintenance of truth is rather God's charge, and the continuance of charity ours."* The difficulty about the "latitude-men," as the Cambridge Platonists were called, was that you never knew where they were.

The battle was not fought over ceremonies, which had little interest either for Whichcote or his adversaries. They were all agreed that the main thing was the sermon. And an occasional tilt at Rome, with the toleration of most else, is all the liturgical instruction to be found in these sermons. But in dogma every preacher had his word to say. And though

* *Letters*, p. 118.

Whichcote's opponents differed among themselves on many things, yet they were all agreed that the use of their reason was mischievous. Perhaps they were right. The letters between Whichcote and Tuckney form a useful record of such controversy. Tuckney, who had helped to frame, but declined to enforce, the Westminster Confession, defended a rigid system of Calvinist dogma, based on the biblical text. He objected that Whichcote exalted reason at the expense of faith, and questioned those "decrees of God" which reason could not reconcile with His goodness. He frowned at the suggestion that in some disputed matters Scripture seemed to go both ways, and that men ought to emphasize the texts on which they were agreed. Too much was said of man's inherent worth, so that heathen philosophers became "much fairer candidates for heaven" than Scripture seemed to admit. In fact, the whole teaching was—

> "A kind of moral divinity minted, only with a little tincture of Christ added."*

To such attacks Whichcote opposed his faith in reason, in man's intelligence recollected, as in the sight of God. He did not oppose to Calvinism another theological system. The reader will find that no such system can be drawn from the work of the Cambridge Platonists. They felt, perhaps, the surfeit of dogma. They discussed the immediate experience of a religious mind rather than the theories of theology. John Smith, who was Whichcote's pupil, insisted that Christianity was a divine life, rather than a divine science, and he did not look kindly on those systems of theology in which divinity was not "enshrined but entombed." Such preoccupation with the raw material of religion—the spiritual impressions felt by a religious mind—is apt to end in a certain incoherence, if expressed; if silent, in mysticism. From mysticism, as a disease, the sound mind of Whichcote was singularly free. But there is no hard line separating mysticism from those movements of the mind which normally lead men to religion. And the blending of reason and mysticism is found in the writings of the Cambridge Platonists.

Whichcote had no historical conception of the Church, and shewed no interest in the development of Christianity regarded as a tradition in European society. His appeal is always to reason, here and now, working on a Revelation under his hand. On Church government there is not a word. Yet the topic had been raised by the defeat of Laud when he was young, and the Restoration in his middle age. But he passed it by. He

* *Letters*, p. 39.

has hardly anything to say about any sacrament. To him, the whole system of institutional religion remains dead ground. It is not therefore surprising that the development of that religion has been little influenced by his work.

But as long as Platonism enlightens Christianity, that work will last. True, there is much to regret about the Cambridge Platonists. Their feeling for beauty was too mystical to restore, with Greek philosophy, an appreciation of Greek art; or to inform the Christian tradition with a feeling for natural loveliness. There are passages in John Smith's Discourses which a poet will read with pleasure. And some beauty may emerge from Henry More's obscure verses. None will be found in Cudworth's museum of classical opinions. And there is little in Whichcote. But if the Greek tradition still wins for Christianity those whose main interest lies, not in a sense of sin, but in the power of the human mind to enjoy beauty and order here on earth, this is partly due to the Cambridge Platonists. And as long as we recognize a sound tradition we shall love the men who lived to interpret it.

IV

Selections from Whichcote's Aphorisms

1. To go against reason is to go against God. It is the self-same thing to do that which the reason of the case doth require, and that which God Himself doth appoint. It is the very voice of God.

2. The practice of religion is the true use of those faculties which God hath invested human nature with.

3. Nothing is more credible than that men's states shall differ as much as their Spirits and Tempers do differ.

4. That which is our best Employment here, will be the only Employment in Eternity. There we shall have none but good company. We shall have neither Guilt within us, nor Enemies about us, nor Death before us.

5. The state of religion lies in this—a good mind and a good life, all else is about religion; and men must not put the instrumental part of religion for the state of religion.

6. These two things go together: to know God and to know the difference of Good and Evil.

7. Sublime knowledge cannot dwell in an unquiet spirit.

8. Let those things be left without determination, which may be unknown without harm, but cannot be stated without danger.

9. I have always found that those preachers have most commanded my heart who most illuminated my head.

10. Take every man at his best and you will find him good for something.

11. Religion in the subject is not only a notion but a temper and principle of action.

12. We worship God best when we resemble Him most.

A. C. SCUPHOLME.

"ELIJAH WITH MOSES" IN THE TRANSFIGURATION

THE Transfiguration is a mystery magnetic and mysteriously glorious indeed, like the mysteries of the Crucifixion, Resurrection, and Ascension; and so "many have taken in hand" to try in some measure to interpret it. Mr. H. G. Wood has written: "The Transfiguration is really best understood as a mystic experience of self-dedication and Divine assurance, which Jesus actually went through soon after the decisive disclosure to the disciples of what lay in store for Him. Though the story is told from the point of view of the disciples, who emphasize its influence on them, its true character, as Luke hints, lies in its being a record of the inner life of Jesus." But for all that has been written about it, it would seem that one aspect throwing much—perhaps most—light upon this "inner life of Jesus" has but been somewhat superficially taken for granted, and its real inwardness overlooked, or at least insufficiently explored. This aspect is the presence and part of Moses and Elijah in the mystery. All that Mr. H. G. Wood has to say of them in the passage quoted above is: "Both Moses and Elijah are seen talking with Jesus. Law and Prophecy meet and bear witness to Jesus as the Messiah"; and Dr. A. Plummer calls them here in the Transfiguration simply "representatives of the Law and the Prophets."

Representative of Law and Prophecy Moses and Elijah certainly are; but it is incidental to the mystery of the Transfiguration, and cannot be dismissed as the sum significance even purely as regards their own share in it. Mere "representativeness" is too abstract to be the core of such a unique mystery; at the bed-rock heart of every spiritual experience there must always be the intensely *personal* element, because of the love-flaming Personality of God, its source. Moses and Elijah participated in the Transfiguration as their own *individual*

selves, in virtue of their personal relation not to the body of the Law, or to the school of the Prophets, but to Jesus Himself. Their appearing in glory and conversing with Him was not a mere external episodic expression, in spiritual crisis, of "witness to Jesus as the Messiah"; but the unitive outcome of a life-affinity which—in the vocation of revelation of God to man, and the reconciliation of man to God—our Lord sensed with Moses and Elijah.

This affinity between our Lord and Moses and Elijah must first have been kindled to consciousness for Him through His study of the Scriptures, whence—for Him experientially, and for us in the light of the Gospels—it emerges as so strikingly close, and such a creative and revealing factor in His "inner life," that detailed tracing of it is abundantly repaying and enlightening.

During the "hidden years" at Nazareth our Lord was inescapably and continuously confronted with the necessity of penetrating the meaning, and practical implications, of the stupendous Angel-prophecy pronounced upon Him before His birth: "It is He that shall save His people from their sins." He must needs betake to Himself every resource, both natural and supernatural, for illumination upon a vocation altogether unique in the whole history of Man—mingled burden of exhilaration and awe, joy and woe. Communion with the Father—the communion of the ceaseless prayer of love and adoration, trust and thankfulness, sacrificial self-oblation and obedience, which ran unbrokenly through daily externals—was His prime light. The Father Himself was His interpreter: speaking in many ways and through various mediums: "I do nothing of Myself, but as the Father taught Me. . . ." One of these mediums was the Scriptures.

Our Lord came to the recorded lives of Moses and Elijah as one in a humanly humble and uninfluential position, spiritually isolated in a calling unique alike in magnitude and nature—to be the Saviour of the world. He came to them with His own spiritual achievement all as yet to be achieved; with His own vocation as yet to be fulfilled—a vocation bristling with so many, and such acute, problems and difficulties that human nature, not knowing where to begin, might well have shrunk back appalled even from attempted response. The vocations of Moses and Elijah unfolded before Him, in their striking analogies to His own, must have come to Him as a mine of comfort and illumination, as pointing direct from the Father upon the path that He Himself must follow. The recorded vocations of Moses and Elijah afforded individual and complementary contribution of enlightenment to Him: and through them the Father would

vouchsafe Him ever-deepening understanding of His own vocation so taxing to spiritual and intellectual comprehension. Not only *before* He embarked upon His Public Ministry were Moses and Elijah instructive and inspiring to Him; but often afterwards events in their lives must gradually have mediated fresh comfort in the light of developing events in His own.

The vocation of Moses—as His own too proved to be—taken as a whole, was an ever-swaying alternation between the glory of God's unfolding Self-revelation and Will, and ceaseless human travail and suffering on behalf of, and *at the hands of*, the people to whom God sent him. Jesus must have found both ample encouragement and warning in Moses' fulfilment of his vocation, as He prayer-steeped in it, so that it became a present, living reality.

From very babyhood there were things in common between Him and Moses. As infants both were in danger of their lives by general order of the ruler of their land, and yet were saved and brought by God into the precise environment and circumstances He needed for their years of dawning understanding. Moses, seeing the burdens of his fellow-Hebrews in Egypt, tried impulsively, in his own way and strength, to combat them; and this mistake necessitated flight to save his life—a solemn warning to Another Who must follow a similar path. Withdrawn in Midian, humbly keeping the flock of his father-in-law, in the quiet Moses was prepared for his vocation. In the vision of the burning bush God's call came to him *articulately*. Moses was to bring forth the Hebrews from social and material bondage; whereas our Lord must save His people from the bondage of sin. But none the less, He and Moses are linked as God's *deliverers* of His people; and here in this call of Moses our Lord must have found strong and abiding anchorage of comfort and inspiration. God in heaven had taken account of His people's bondage to another race to deliver them; how much more, therefore, could Jesus rely upon His taking account of their infinitely more enthralling and demoralizing bondage to sin also to deliver them. The basis of Moses' sending was the Eternal Being and Character of God; and his God-given ability to reveal that Eternal God the credentials of his mission—so too for Jesus. How He must have meditated upon Moses' "What shall I say unto them? And God said . . . I AM THAT I AM. . . . Thus shalt thou say . . . I AM hath sent me unto you"—appropriating it for Himself; penetrating to the very heart of the inexhaustible truth and riches of I AM THAT I AM as Moses was never able to do.

As Moses was enabled by God to work "signs" to convince the people of his divine mission, so were "signs" wrought by

our Lord to manifest His glory, "the glory as of the Only-Begotten of the Father."

The endless obstacles with which Moses was confronted in the fulfilment of his vocation must have prepared our Lord what to expect as inevitable, and have warned Him as to what could be obviated; and so enabled Him to prayer-forearm and equip Himself in the light of this knowledge. Moses' overcoming of them must again and again have been a source of inspiration to human endurance and quiet confidence, in the realization that the path He had to tread had—on a lower plane—been at least partially trod before Him. There must have been comfort—to One Who never disdained human help and sympathy—in knowing that in faintly similar part His burden had been experientially understood by another human being, even although centuries ago.

One thing that must have emerged most inescapably for our Lord from the life of Moses was the fact that it was precisely *his own people*, the people to whom he was sent, rather than any or every external opposition, that constituted his fieriest and most sapping obstacle—a chill foreshadowing of "He came unto His own and His own received Him not." How often must He afterwards have found the reproaches and reverses of His ministry already typified in those Moses had had to suffer in the ceaseless complainings and rebellions of his people—a burden humanly intolerable indeed. No mere historical record can the life of Moses have been to our Lord, but a soul-drama which, in deeply intensified and transcended measure, was being re-enacted in His own Person. Moses had cried to God: "What shall I do unto this people? They be almost ready to stone me"; so were they ready to stone Another centuries later. The Hebrews did not desire to be delivered from the Egyptian bondage *at any cost to themselves*; so, too, rather than voluntarily accept the cost of their redemption from sin, the Jews could madly, suicidally cry of their Deliverer: "His blood be on us, and on our children."

Much in prayer was deeply common to our Lord and Moses: the revelation of God given to Moses in the mount; and our Lord often seeking to the hills in His God-revealing prayer. All the vision that Moses received of worship, in connection with the Tabernacle and the Ark, was the stirring to birth of the vision of consummated worship apprehended by our Lord: ". . . The hour cometh, when neither in this mountain, nor in Jerusalem, shall ye worship the Father. . . . But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and truth. . . ." But in *intercession* was the deepest bond. Surely through the unfolding of Moses' intercessory ministry

(*e.g.*, Exod. xxxii. 30-32, Deut. ix. 18 *ff.*) the Father gradually bespoke to the young Jesus—with the gamut of prayer still to learn in all its fulness—the inner meaning and conditions of intercession. Through Moses' achievement God must have pointed Him a far-transcending ideal of vicarious penitence, sacrificial self-oblation, and pleading of righteousness, which was eventually to culminate in nothing less than an Eternal High Priestly intercession, ceaselessly pleading before the Father the one and only "full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world." His faith in the potency of such intercessory prayer must have been kindled by the repeated efficacy of Moses' prayer-intervention for the sinful and rebellious (*e.g.*, Num. xi. 1-2, Num. xii. 13-14).

The truth underlying Moses' creative interpretation and summing-up of the corporate experience of the Exodus—"man doth not live by bread only, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord, doth man live"—was so deeply assimilated by our Lord, that He spontaneously used it to rebut part of His own personal temptation in the wilderness.

The fate of Moses must have stabbed home aweing warning against even infinitesimal self-overstepping of any command of God to the Lad Who was to follow in his footsteps as *the* Deliverer of time and of Eternity. As the shadow of the Cross fell upon our Lord just in the tinglingly and maturely *alive* thirties, and He came to realize that death must eclipse for Him all humanly visible results of His sacrificial ministry, *what* a final sense of oneness He must have felt with Moses, who was not allowed to see the consummation of his travail or to enter into his victory on earth, but was told by God that he must die when "his eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated."

Through meditation on the record of the life of Elijah, and its spiritual extension in that of Elisha, the Father must have opened up altogether new vistas to the boy Jesus, bringing the supernatural into practical relationship and harmony with the natural for the effecting of God's purposes, and giving Him an inexhaustible vision of the limitless divine resources of spiritual law transcending, but not contradicting, natural law.

Our Lord must have felt an innate oneness with Elijah, the "solitary prophet," belonging to no prophetic settlement or company, whose office was grounded simply and solely in his personal relationship and response to God: "As the Lord God of Israel liveth, before Whom I stand"—a relationship of vital communion with God: a ministry of obedience ever in His Presence. Our Lord must have derived much inspiration and joy—since He always delighted in good wherever and however it was to be found—from Elijah's mingled humility and boldness

in God's service, his moral courage and faithfulness to divine leadings.

The story of the widow of Zarephath, referred to by Him in the synagogue at Nazareth—with its "many days . . . the barrel of meal wasted not, neither did the cruse of oil fail, according to the word of the Lord, which He spoke by Elijah"—must have borne in upon Him a vivid realization of the limitless power of God over matter to suffice human need: meditation on this underlying His faith-certainty over the feeding of the thousands with resources humanly, utterly inadequate.

The story of Elijah's raising from the dead the widow's son by prayer was provocative witness to Him of the power of prayer to achieve the humanly impossible in life-giving renewal and comfort to others: and much meditation on this must have preceded His own miracles of raising the dead.

Elijah's moral courage in bringing to a head, on Mount Carmel, the spiritual issue between the worship of Jehovah and of Baal, with all the human odds against him and in spiritual loneliness, must have been to our Lord an inspiring prefiguration of His own setting His face toward Jerusalem, deliberately to force the spiritual issue of all time: "Now is the judgment of this world," through the inescapable choice to be made between Him and the "prince of this world."

The taking up of Elijah by the whirlwind into heaven, and the bestowal of a double portion of his spirit upon Elisha. must have given our Lord infinite food for meditation, and thrown light upon the final training-goal for His disciples: and it would extend His affinity with Elijah to Elisha also—an inextricable spiritual unity.

The story of the deadly pottage, made harmless by Elisha's casting meal into the pot, must have been used by the Father to open up to the boy Jesus the whole vision of *transmutation* of death into life, of sin into holiness—which became the substance of His ministry in time and in Eternity.

But Moses and Elijah were not mere historical prototypes to our Lord: not even analogous experiences of spirit and ministry exhaust the link. The link was a conscious, living, personal relationship in the Communion of Saints—for Him humanly an *attrait* given by the Father for Kingdom purposes. Passed through death, the eyes of Moses and Elijah must have been opened to the vision of the Messiah, who should crown their labours by saving His people and perfecting the worship of God. *How*, and with what *understanding*, must Moses, who suffered so oppressively at the hands of those whom he was called to lead out of Egypt (Num. xi. 11), have prayed for Him who should bear the sins of the whole world, and give His own

flesh to be the life of man. Inevitably the prayer of Moses and Elijah "from above" must have drawn Him into a vital spiritual relationship with them; and often must He have been conscious not only of inspiration from their earthly ministry, but mediation from their heavenly ministry also. Their appearing and conversing with Him at the Transfiguration was—though supernatural—yet a natural consummation of a lifelong communing of spirit. It is an enlightening enrichment to realize our Lord's spiritual anchorage in the Communion of Saints, as well as in individual union with the Father.

One point in the Gospel accounts of the Transfiguration is very liable to pass unnoticed—namely, that although Matthew and Luke both preserve the natural order "Moses and Elijah," Mark (ix. 4) has: "And there appeared unto them *Elijah with Moses*." Moffatt translates "Elijah along with Moses"; and Weymouth—perhaps more happily—"Elijah accompanied by Moses." C. H. Turner, referring to this, writes: "'Elijah with Moses,' an odd way of collocating the two names (both Matthew and Luke substitute 'Moses and Elijah'), due perhaps to the fact that Elijah was much in their thoughts at the time (Mark viii. 28; ix. 11). The natural order is given in *v.* 5." But nothing in the Gospels is accidentally "odd": there is significance in all things therein. Mark's unusual reversal must have been deliberate: and since his account was derived from the eye-witness St. Peter, doubtless it expresses some emphasis of Peter's personal reflective realization of the precedence of Elijah's part in the mystery over that of Moses. The natural order being restored in *v.* 5 in Peter's, "Rabbi, it is good for us to be here: and let us make three tabernacles: one for Thee, one for Moses, and one for Elijah," is easily accountable—"For he wist not what to answer; for they became sore afraid": just any words that sprang to mind, and so before there was any coherent reflection the natural old order of "Moses and Elijah" tumbled out automatically.

Is the individual contribution of Moses and Elijah to this mystery implicit in St. Luke's Gospel? Luke (ix. 30-31) tells: "And behold there talked with Him two men which were Moses and Elijah; who appeared in glory; and spake of His decease (*τὴν ἔξοδον αὐτοῦ*) which He was about to accomplish at Jerusalem." But "decease" or death is only one—and perhaps a secondary—meaning of ἔξοδυς, which means basically "a going out," "departure" (from a place). Their talk could not have been confined to His *death*, as apart from the Resurrection and Ascension, which were inextricably part of the whole process of His ἔξοδυς. Surely Moses, who prefigured His travail and Passion, would speak of the death: and Elijah, who

prefigured the taking up into heaven and the legacy of the double portion of spirit, would—glory-crowningly—speak of the Resurrection, Ascension, and Pentecost: each having been praying for Him specially in relation to the particular coming mysteries which he himself best experientially understood. Our Lord's Transfiguration was due to prayer-realization and acceptance not of His death—that was already apprehended—but of His Resurrection, Ascension, and Pentecost, in a newness of comprehension surpassing anything spiritually perceived by Him before; and consequently evoking from Him a surpassing self-abandonment to "the grace of God . . . upon Him."

Moses and Elijah were not mere "witnesses," or even only mediators, to Jesus in the Transfiguration; they were also recipients of infinite grace therein. To *see* Jesus, and Him transfigured, what surpassing compensation for him who—for one unpremeditated self-overstepping of God's command in all his years of travail for His people—had been withheld from himself attaining to the Promised Land. Ever after, the worship of Moses and Elijah must have taken on an altogether new content of *adoration*—and thanksgiving: thanksgiving for such a consummation of their prayer-communing with their Lord Incarnate; for the unspeakable joy and privilege of being allowed and enabled to minister light and confirmation to Him before His Agony and Passion; and for the deepened supernatural union with Him, pledge in time of its continuance and development through death into Eternity—an eternal interchange of love with Love.

MAISIE SPENS.

AN AMERICAN PROPHET OF SOCIAL RIGHTEOUSNESS

REINHOLD NIEBUHR* is professor in the Union Theological Seminary in New York, and is well known in America as a speaker and writer upon political and religious subjects; he is described as "the most sought after and most influential speaker to students in America." He is to be distinguished from his brother, Professor H. Richard Niebuhr, who does not agree with all his conclusions, and who is author of *The Social Sources of Denominationalism* (Henry Holt and Co.), a book which aims at

* The principal works of Reinhold Niebuhr, which we have used in this study, are: (1) An essay in *A Traffic in Knowledge*, edited by W. A. Visser t'Hooft (S.C.M. Press); (2) *Moral Man and Immoral Society* (Scribners); and (3) *Reflections on the End of an Era* (Scribners). *Cf.* also his *Does Civilization Need Religion?* and *Leaves from the Notebook of a Tamed Cynic.*

shewing that denominational differences are due to many other factors than theological or liturgical divergences—especially political, social, and economic ones. A brilliant and provocative writer, Reinhold Niebuhr states in forceful language a position not very familiar to English people. Although very condensed, his essay in *A Traffic in Knowledge* is perhaps the best introduction to his point of view. Then perhaps *Reflections on the End of an Era* should be read; this, though a bigger book, is a collection of occasional essays and papers—"Tracts for the Times," as they are called in the Preface. To complete the reader's introduction to the point of view of this penetrating American thinker he should then read *Moral Man and Immoral Society*, which is more systematic and is written in a spirited controversial and militant style.

A word of caution should be issued at the outset to English readers who have read little non-English work on socio-religious topics. Niebuhr's approach is definitely through the existing political, social, and economic background primarily of American, then of continental, life; hence one will perhaps be spared a certain feeling of impatience if one remembers that he is not thinking primarily of the English situation. Several times he himself makes it clear that he regards the situation in England as being in certain respects different from that of all other countries;* he does not attempt to simplify his problem by minimizing local differences, and he does not assume that all nations must undergo an exactly similar process of development, as Marxist theorists frequently seem to suppose. Yet his work is none the less important for English students, since the reaction of the various strata of English society to changing world-conditions is not fundamentally different from that of other nations' class reactions.†

Niebuhr is a theologian who is profoundly interested in the impact of political, social, and economic forces upon the conception of God. He combines the religious insight and moral indignation of the Hebrew prophet, faced with the injustices of contemporary civilization, with the critical analytical judgment of an academic sociologist. He shares with the Marxists the view that man's religious ideas are ultimately based upon his political, social, and economic position and outlook—a view which has never been popular with rationalist and liberal theologians. It implies that there are different kinds of Christianity for different social classes; thus, in England the older aristocracy and their retainers remained within the Church of England, but the rising bourgeoisie became liberal and Non-

* *Cf.*, *e.g.*, *Reflections*, pp. 51, 72; *Moral Man*, pp. 204 *f.*
† *Moral Man*, p. 205 *ff.*

conformist. Furthermore, it is obvious that since the Churches of today are on the whole catering only for the privileged classes, with occasional efforts at "charitable" works towards the disinherited, Christianity is rejected by proletarians as an upper- and middle-class sentimentalism, the opium of the people:

> "The Christian Church has so generally substituted the ideal of philanthropy for the ideal of love, that it has made the ideal of love odious to the under-privileged world, and has prompted the cry for justice rather than love from those who suffer at the hands of the powerful and privileged."*

It is becoming increasingly obvious today that vital religious differences are not chiefly theological in motive, but economic and social; hence the day of the cloistered and academic theologian is over. Vital theologies are hammered out on the anvil of life rather than in the secluded calm of cathedral precincts. The weakness of liberalism in religion is that it has always ignored this fact—at least in its attitude towards contemporary religious forms.

The decay of the Old Capitalism of the nineteenth century is thus the explanation of the decay of the older religious liberalism. That liberalism with its secularized religion, its shallow optimism and naive belief in progress, so often criticized by Dr. Inge, finds a sterner and more realistic critic in Niebuhr. The liberal assumption that we are progressing in our social relationships, that what we need is a little more education here and a fresh presentation of the ethics of Jesus there, that society would be Christianized if only we taught more the religion of Jesus instead of the religion about Him—this assumption "was significantly due to the influence of eighteenth-century rationalism and nineteenth-century liberalism and not to elements in Christianity itself."†

> "If Jesus ever had a faith in the possibility of making the love-ideal progressively applicable to the present world (a faith comparable to that of liberal Protestantism), it belonged to the early days of his ministry and was transmuted into a catastrophic hope as his own cross became imminent."‡

Niebuhr denounces liberal Protestantism, since it encourages a *laissez-faire* attitude towards social effort, as largely responsible for the rejection of Christianity by the working classes of Europe and America:

* *Traffic in Knowledge*, p. 72; *cf.* also a striking passage in *Moral Man*, p. 80.
† *Reflections*, p. 213. ‡ *Ibid.*, p. 212.

> "Since liberal Protestantism is, on the whole, the religion of the privileged classes of Western civilization, it is not surprising that its espousal of the ideal of love, in a civilization reeking with social injustice, should be cynically judged and convicted of hypocrisy by those in whom bitter social experiences destroy the sentimentalities of the comfortable."*

Niebuhr urges that what is wrong with religious liberalism is its doctrine of man, which deviates from classical Christianity through its optimism; this gives rise to sentimentalism. On the other hand, it is easy in such times as ours to go too far in the opposite direction—to take a pessimistic view of human nature and to regard it as utterly depraved. This has produced "the violent reaction of neo-orthodoxy (*e.g.*, Barthianism) to the moral pretensions of liberal Christianity which came to a head when the world war revealed how hollow these pretensions were and how little they had affected the brutalities of men and nations."†

> "If the emphasis upon God's holiness and man's sin becomes so absolute as to lead to an unqualifiedly pessimistic attitude towards human nature in its natural state, as in the case of the neo-orthodoxy of our day, it becomes just as unrealistic as the romantic over-estimate of human virtue which has characterized the thought of the past two centuries. . . . Any theology which tempts men to believe that distinctions in the moral quality of human character have no religious significance ultimately makes religion an unmitigated peril to moral effort."‡

Accordingly Niebuhr believes that the only adequate estimate of human nature for our times is that of classical Christianity. He stresses the importance of finding a realistic doctrine of man, since both optimism and pessimism alike sap the springs of moral effort. The classical Christian conception of the natural man as unable to redeem himself by his own efforts, and yet as essentially redeemable, is, he thinks, the only view which is capable of initiating and sustaining moral endeavour. He elaborates this view in a remarkable essay in *Reflections* entitled "The Political Realism of Christian Orthodoxy." An appreciation of this basic conviction of his thought enables us to understand what he means by saying in the Preface to *Reflections* that

* *Moral Man*, p. 80. † *Traffic in Knowledge*, p. 76. ‡ *Ibid.*, pp. 64 *f.*

> "adequate spiritual guidance can come only through a more radical political orientation and more conservative religious convictions than are comprehended in the culture of our era."

This attempt to unite Christian orthodoxy with political radicalism will, he believes, strike the modern mind as bizarre and capricious, since "it will satisfy neither the liberals in politics and religion, nor the political radicals nor the devotees of traditional Christianity."*

Niebuhr believes that the truest visions of religion are illusions—in the sense that the perfect society is unattainable on the earth. Yet it is only when men believe that it is attainable and bend all their energies to its realization that religion is effective as a moulding force in civilization.† Man's everlasting quest for the unattainable is our evidence that he is incurably religious. Men are irreligious in our generation not because they do not like the creeds of the Churches or have reacted from old-fashioned teaching; these things do not make men irreligious—they make men evolve new creeds and teachings. Men are irreligious because organized religion has been exploited by the possessing classes. Here is a fact to which liberals are blind:

> "More men in our modern era are irreligious because religion has failed to make civilization ethical than because it has failed to maintain its intellectual respectability."‡

Niebuhr suggests no easy way out of the modern social confusion. He does not seem confident that the old capitalist order will pass away without even further violence and bloodshed than has already surrounded its death-bed. We are in an age of transition to a new order—not necessarily a better order, since human nature without God does not inevitably progress. In the crisis organized religion is on the side of the dying system and is an instrument of the decaying ruling classes. The leaders of tomorrow have learnt either to despise or to hate Christianity according as they are enlightened bourgeoisie or proletarians. Religion is dying along with the ruthless civilization which made her its handmaid, because religious men betrayed the truth in which they professed to believe, and prostituted it as the slave of their own class-interests, economic greed, and comfortable sentimentalisms. These are grave charges. Many who have been nurtured in the comfortable halls of religious liberalism will turn away with loathing from the picture thus presented; so

* *Reflections*, p. ix. † *Moral Man*, p. 81.
‡ *Does Civilization Need Religion?*, p. 12.

did the aristocracy of Russia hide their eyes from the light until the Revolution came; so did the possessing class in every instance which history records until at last the armour wherein they trusted was taken away. But history marches with a "dialectical" necessity which will not be stayed.

We hope that this inadequate review of the thought of a keen observer of the present religious situation will turn many English liberals to a first-hand study of his writings. Liberalism has reached a crisis today in which the great danger is that what is good in it will be denied in a wave of reaction because liberal theologians are not sufficiently realist to face the facts as they are. At least Niebuhr will help us to face the facts, and may indeed provide a starting-place for the creation of a more realistic world-view which yet denies nothing of the truth which liberalism has seen.

ALAN RICHARDSON.

MISCELLANEA

CORRESPONDENCE

APPROACH TO REUNION

SIR,

There are three objections to Fr. St. John's attractive proposals, which he does not appear to have considered.

(1) There is this difference between an Anglican approach to (say) Baptists, and a Roman approach to Anglicans. If the Baptists came into the Anglican Communion, they would be given a share in its government, even in the Church of England, and much more definitely in all other Anglican Churches. But if we went into the Roman Communion, individually or corporately, we should be given no share in its government or the direction of its policy (unless any of us happened to be made a cardinal!). Anglo-Catholics and Protestants alike believe in government responsible, at all events in part, to the governed, and free criticism: Roman Catholics believe in dictatorship by Divine right, accompanied by a strict censorship.

(2) The meeting of small groups to discuss reunion in a friendly spirit must have one condition: no deliberate proselytizing. It is because both sides know that no proselytizing will be attempted that we can discuss reunion freely with Orthodox, Lutheran, and other Christians (I write as one who has had considerable experience of such discussions). If Roman Catholics wish for similar friendly discussions, they must stop their proselytizing, withdraw their C.T.S. pamphlets against us, and forbid all attacks on Anglicanism, in public and in private. Frankly, I don't see how Rome can consistently do this, and that is one reason why all discussions of reunion with Roman Catholics seem to me futile. For until she does, the necessary atmosphere of friendliness cannot exist.

I do not resent the fact that Rome does not recognize me as a priest, any more than I recognize the Pope as the successor of St. Peter and Vicar of Christ. But I do resent attempts to shake my loyalty to the Church of England, especially when they take the form of anonymous letters (I got another a fortnight ago) beginning, "Dear Sir, You are only a layman"! And I should, if I were a parish priest, resent much more strongly the unceasing efforts of Roman proselytizers to steal my people, including children and uneducated persons who cannot appreciate the real points at issue.

(3) A further source of irritation is the unfair and humiliating conditions imposed by Rome in the case of mixed marriages. No doubt they were laid down with excellent intentions, but from our point of view it is unjust that the non-Roman partner should have to promise never to try to convert the Roman partner, who makes no such promise, that they must be married in a Roman church and not in any other church as well, and that all the children must always be brought up Roman Catholics.

In these circumstances it is no wonder that many of us are "hostile and suspicious." It is proselytizing that poisons our relations to one another, proselytizing which appeals, with more psychological touch,

to the imagination and the emotions. Rome has been beaten over and over again in argument: no one has ever attempted to answer the crushing logic of Salmon, Denny, and Fr. Puller. But the victims of Roman proselytizing are incapable of understanding it. Since we are responsible for protecting our people from what we believe to be false doctrine, contrary to the Catholic Faith "as this Church and realm hath received the same," we must be excused if we refuse even to discuss reunion as long as proselytizing continues. "In vain is the net spread in the sight of any bird!"

I remain, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
C. B. Moss.

St. Boniface College,
Warminster,
May 18, 1935.

Sir,

I have read with great interest and some sympathy Father St. John's article on "The Approach to Reunion." May I make a few criticisms on it? First, then, his statement that the Roman Catholic Church in England today is descended from Tudor times is directly contrary to the statements of Roman Catholic writers of the last century. Father Humphrey, S.J., in *The Divine Teacher* says: "We are a new mission straight from Rome. Ours is a new wave of Christianity from Rome, to take the place of St. Augustine's, when it was lost in the shifting sands of the Reformation. . . . In this fact of our not being lineally descended from the pre-Reformation Church, but derived straight from Rome, I see the finger of God" (quoted by Bishop Collins in his *Lectures on the English Reformation and its Consequences*).

The same statement was made many years ago in a document in which Roman Catholics renounced all claim to the endowments of the Church of England.

Secondly, Father St. John says the Church of England is as exclusive as his own Church. That may be so, but he forgets that, in the opinion of most Anglicans, his Church has added to the original deposit of the Faith, and may do so again tomorrow, and yet require her members to believe those new articles. This fact would seem to make Anglican exclusiveness more reasonable than Roman exclusiveness.

Thirdly, while condemning with him the persecutions of Romanists, I notice that he follows the practice of many of his fellow-churchmen in entirely ignoring the Marian Persecution.

The Roman Church, in fact, has never renounced the principle of religious persecution, though, as Salembier says in discussing the burning of Hus: "Aujourd'hui, après cet interrogatoire ecclésiastique, la peine est toute spirituelle" (*Le Grand Schism d'Occident*, p. 343).

Yours, etc.,
Roger F. Markham.

Aughton Rectory,
Ormskirk, Lancs,
June 10, 1935.

MISCELLANEA

CORRESPONDENCE

APPROACH TO REUNION

SIR,

There are three objections to Fr. St. John's attractive proposals, which he does not appear to have considered.

(1) There is this difference between an Anglican approach to (say) Baptists, and a Roman approach to Anglicans. If the Baptists came into the Anglican Communion, they would be given a share in its government, even in the Church of England, and much more definitely in all other Anglican Churches. But if we went into the Roman Communion, individually or corporately, we should be given no share in its government or the direction of its policy (unless any of us happened to be made a cardinal!). Anglo-Catholics and Protestants alike believe in government responsible, at all events in part, to the governed, and free criticism: Roman Catholics believe in dictatorship by Divine right, accompanied by a strict censorship.

(2) The meeting of small groups to discuss reunion in a friendly spirit must have one condition: no deliberate proselytizing. It is because both sides know that no proselytizing will be attempted that we can discuss reunion freely with Orthodox, Lutheran, and other Christians (I write as one who has had considerable experience of such discussions). If Roman Catholics wish for similar friendly discussions, they must stop their proselytizing, withdraw their C.T.S. pamphlets against us, and forbid all attacks on Anglicanism, in public and in private. Frankly, I don't see how Rome can consistently do this, and that is one reason why all discussions of reunion with Roman Catholics seem to me futile. For until she does, the necessary atmosphere of friendliness cannot exist.

I do not resent the fact that Rome does not recognize me as a priest, any more than I recognize the Pope as the successor of St. Peter and Vicar of Christ. But I do resent attempts to shake my loyalty to the Church of England, especially when they take the form of anonymous letters (I got another a fortnight ago) beginning, "Dear Sir, You are only a layman"! And I should, if I were a parish priest, resent much more strongly the unceasing efforts of Roman proselytizers to steal my people, including children and uneducated persons who cannot appreciate the real points at issue.

(3) A further source of irritation is the unfair and humiliating conditions imposed by Rome in the case of mixed marriages. No doubt they were laid down with excellent intentions, but from our point of view it is unjust that the non-Roman partner should have to promise never to try to convert the Roman partner, who makes no such promise, that they must be married in a Roman church and not in any other church as well, and that all the children must always be brought up Roman Catholics.

In these circumstances it is no wonder that many of us are "hostile and suspicious." It is proselytizing that poisons our relations to one another, proselytizing which appeals, with more psychological touch,

to the imagination and the emotions. Rome has been beaten over and over again in argument: no one has ever attempted to answer the crushing logic of Salmon, Denny, and Fr. Puller. But the victims of Roman proselytizing are incapable of understanding it. Since we are responsible for protecting our people from what we believe to be false doctrine, contrary to the Catholic Faith "as this Church and realm hath received the same," we must be excused if we refuse even to discuss reunion as long as proselytizing continues. "In vain is the net spread in the sight of any bird!"

I remain, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
C. B. Moss.

St. Boniface College,
Warminster,
May 18, 1935.

Sir,

I have read with great interest and some sympathy Father St. John's article on "The Approach to Reunion." May I make a few criticisms on it? First, then, his statement that the Roman Catholic Church in England today is descended from Tudor times is directly contrary to the statements of Roman Catholic writers of the last century. Father Humphrey, S.J., in *The Divine Teacher* says: "We are a new mission straight from Rome. Ours is a new wave of Christianity from Rome, to take the place of St. Augustine's, when it was lost in the shifting sands of the Reformation. . . . In this fact of our not being lineally descended from the pre-Reformation Church, but derived straight from Rome, I see the finger of God" (quoted by Bishop Collins in his *Lectures on the English Reformation and its Consequences*).

The same statement was made many years ago in a document in which Roman Catholics renounced all claim to the endowments of the Church of England.

Secondly, Father St. John says the Church of England is as exclusive as his own Church. That may be so, but he forgets that, in the opinion of most Anglicans, his Church has added to the original deposit of the Faith, and may do so again tomorrow, and yet require her members to believe those new articles. This fact would seem to make Anglican exclusiveness more reasonable than Roman exclusiveness.

Thirdly, while condemning with him the persecutions of Romanists, I notice that he follows the practice of many of his fellow-churchmen in entirely ignoring the Marian Persecution.

The Roman Church, in fact, has never renounced the principle of religious persecution, though, as Salembier says in discussing the burning of Hus: "Aujourd'hui, après cet interrogatoire ecclésiastique, la peine est toute spirituelle" (*Le Grand Schism d'Occident*, p. 343).

Yours, etc.,
Roger F. Markham.

Aughton Rectory,
Ormskirk, Lancs,
June 10, 1935.

MISCELLANEA

CORRESPONDENCE

APPROACH TO REUNION

SIR,

There are three objections to Fr. St. John's attractive proposals, which he does not appear to have considered.

(1) There is this difference between an Anglican approach to (say) Baptists, and a Roman approach to Anglicans. If the Baptists came into the Anglican Communion, they would be given a share in its government, even in the Church of England, and much more definitely in all other Anglican Churches. But if we went into the Roman Communion, individually or corporately, we should be given no share in its government or the direction of its policy (unless any of us happened to be made a cardinal!). Anglo-Catholics and Protestants alike believe in government responsible, at all events in part, to the governed, and free criticism: Roman Catholics believe in dictatorship by Divine right, accompanied by a strict censorship.

(2) The meeting of small groups to discuss reunion in a friendly spirit must have one condition: no deliberate proselytizing. It is because both sides know that no proselytizing will be attempted that we can discuss reunion freely with Orthodox, Lutheran, and other Christians (I write as one who has had considerable experience of such discussions). If Roman Catholics wish for similar friendly discussions, they must stop their proselytizing, withdraw their C.T.S. pamphlets against us, and forbid all attacks on Anglicanism, in public and in private. Frankly, I don't see how Rome can consistently do this, and that is one reason why all discussions of reunion with Roman Catholics seem to me futile. For until she does, the necessary atmosphere of friendliness cannot exist.

I do not resent the fact that Rome does not recognize me as a priest, any more than I recognize the Pope as the successor of St. Peter and Vicar of Christ. But I do resent attempts to shake my loyalty to the Church of England, especially when they take the form of anonymous letters (I got another a fortnight ago) beginning, "Dear Sir, You are only a layman"! And I should, if I were a parish priest, resent much more strongly the unceasing efforts of Roman proselytizers to steal my people, including children and uneducated persons who cannot appreciate the real points at issue.

(3) A further source of irritation is the unfair and humiliating conditions imposed by Rome in the case of mixed marriages. No doubt they were laid down with excellent intentions, but from our point of view it is unjust that the non-Roman partner should have to promise never to try to convert the Roman partner, who makes no such promise, that they must be married in a Roman church and not in any other church as well, and that all the children must always be brought up Roman Catholics.

In these circumstances it is no wonder that many of us are "hostile and suspicious." It is proselytizing that poisons our relations to one another, proselytizing which appeals, with more psychological touch,

to the imagination and the emotions. Rome has been beaten over and over again in argument: no one has ever attempted to answer the crushing logic of Salmon, Denny, and Fr. Puller. But the victims of Roman proselytizing are incapable of understanding it. Since we are responsible for protecting our people from what we believe to be false doctrine, contrary to the Catholic Faith "as this Church and realm hath received the same," we must be excused if we refuse even to discuss reunion as long as proselytizing continues. "In vain is the net spread in the sight of any bird!"

I remain, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
C. B. Moss.

St. Boniface College,
Warminster,
May 18, 1935.

Sir,

I have read with great interest and some sympathy Father St. John's article on "The Approach to Reunion." May I make a few criticisms on it? First, then, his statement that the Roman Catholic Church in England today is descended from Tudor times is directly contrary to the statements of Roman Catholic writers of the last century. Father Humphrey, S.J., in *The Divine Teacher* says: "We are a new mission straight from Rome. Ours is a new wave of Christianity from Rome, to take the place of St. Augustine's, when it was lost in the shifting sands of the Reformation. . . . In this fact of our not being lineally descended from the pre-Reformation Church, but derived straight from Rome, I see the finger of God" (quoted by Bishop Collins in his *Lectures on the English Reformation and its Consequences*).

The same statement was made many years ago in a document in which Roman Catholics renounced all claim to the endowments of the Church of England.

Secondly, Father St. John says the Church of England is as exclusive as his own Church. That may be so, but he forgets that, in the opinion of most Anglicans, his Church has added to the original deposit of the Faith, and may do so again tomorrow, and yet require her members to believe those new articles. This fact would seem to make Anglican exclusiveness more reasonable than Roman exclusiveness.

Thirdly, while condemning with him the persecutions of Romanists, I notice that he follows the practice of many of his fellow-churchmen in entirely ignoring the Marian Persecution.

The Roman Church, in fact, has never renounced the principle of religious persecution, though, as Salembier says in discussing the burning of Hus: "Aujourd'hui, après cet interrogatoire ecclésiastique, la peine est toute spirituelle" (*Le Grand Schism d'Occident*, p. 343).

Yours, etc.,
Roger F. Markham.

Aughton Rectory,
Ormskirk, Lancs,
June 10, 1935.

ENGLISH BISHOPS AT THE NORMAN CONQUEST

DEAR SIR,

I note that in a review on p. 56 of the current issue of THEOLOGY it is asserted that St. Wulstan, Bishop of Worcester, was the only English Bishop who was allowed to retain his see after the Conquest. But here in the west the Conquerer found two other Bishops appointed by the Confessor whom he left undisturbed. Bishop Leofric of Exeter and Bishop Giso of Wells both came from Lorraine (or Lotharingia), and both had based their Cathedral Constitutions, etc., on the Rule of Bishop Chrodegang of Metz (as modified at the Council of Aachen). Leofric's MS. of this rule is still in the library of C.C.C., Cambridge.

Incidentally, Leofric's predecessor at Crediton was also proximate predecessor of St. Wulstan at Worcester, holding that and the Cornish see in plurality.

Yours faithfully,
H. E. BISHOP.

85, MAGDALEN ROAD,
EXETER,
July 8, 1935.

NOTE ON 1 PET. ii. 19, 20. ΧΑΡΙΣ AS "THANKWORTHY"

19. *τοῦτο γὰρ χάρις, εἰ διὰ συνείδησιν Θεοῦ ὑποφέρει τις λύπας, πάσχων ἀδίκως.* 20. *ποῖον γὰρ κλέος, εἰ ἁμαρτάνοντες καὶ κολαφιζόμενοι ὑπομενεῖτε; ἀλλ' εἰ ἀγαθοποιοῦντες καὶ πάσχοντες ὑπομενεῖτε, τοῦτο χάρις παρὰ Θεῷ.*

A.V. translates *χάρις thankworthy* in *v.* 19, and *acceptable* in *v.* 20. R.V. has *acceptable* in both, with "Gr. *grace*" in the margin.

The late Bishop Masterman in his notes on the whole section, which are of great spiritual beauty, writes: "The use of *χάρις* here recalls the Lord's question in Luke vi. 32, *ποία ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστί*. We must not translate *this constitutes a claim on God's favour*, which seems implied in the *thankworthy* of the A.V."

However, there seems to be an element of truth in *thankworthy*, which may be supported by Luke vi. 35 and Rom. iv. 4, in both of which cases *χάρις* is set in some relation to the word *μισθός*.

In Luke vi. 32-35, after asking *what thank have ye?* (A.V. *and* R.V.) three times, our Lord goes on to say: "But love ye your enemies, and do good, and lend, hoping for nothing again (R.V. never despairing); and your reward shall be great, and ye shall be the children of the Highest."

In Rom. iv. 4, *τῷ δὲ ἐργαζομένῳ ὁ μισθὸς οὐ λογίζεται κατὰ χάριν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ ὀφείλημα*. Here it is implied that a reward may be due either as a debt or as a matter of free gratitude. And the man who carries your bag and "leaves it to you" to decide what to give him in return affords a good illustration of the distinction, and suggests that it stands for a real difference, and one that justifies the translation *thankworthy* in 1 Peter ii. 19.

There are two parables of our Lord which seem to stand for complementary and balancing sides of the whole truth about rewards. One is that of the "unprofitable servants" in Luke xvii. 7-10. Against a

one-sided interpretation of this parable our hearts cry out every time we thank a good servant for doing us a service gracefully. The other is that most moving of all parables (Luke xii. 35-37) in which our Lord represents Himself as returning late at night from a marriage feast, and being admitted promptly by vigilant servants as soon as He knocks at the door. Here, with a strength of emotion which can only be explained by reference to His inward vision of the spiritual fulfilment of His words in the world to come, He proceeds to say: "Verily I say unto you, that He shall gird Himself, and make them sit down to meat, and will come forth and serve them."

Perhaps we may say that the former parable stands for the principle that a self-regarding and perfunctory performance of a duty has indeed a claim for a reward which is a *μισθός κατὰ ὀφείλημα*, and which is discharged in the wages of a hired servant (*μισθωτός*) or the keep of a slave, but can expect no special expression of gratitude from the master. The other seems to teach that a faithful servant's prompt discharge of a duty in spite of temptation deserves the humble gratitude of any master, and will win an overwhelming recognition from our Lord Himself in due season.* This raises the whole relationship of master and servant to a higher level, the level of grace or *χάρις* in the highest sense of the word.

May we not hope to find in some such direction as this a core of evangelical truth in the mediæval doctrine of Merit, which seems indeed, as Article XIV. says, to be refuted by St. Luke xvii. 10, and has shewn itself to be capable of grave degradation, but which, if raised to the level of mutual generosity and charity, seems to be vindicated and supported by the instincts of a generous heart in many directions, human and divine?

F. M. D.

June 17, 1935.

MASCULINE OR NEUTER?

THE Note in the May issue (p. 297) on the gender of *ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου* suggests another passage where a masculine interpretation (never to my knowledge suggested in print) gives a better sense. In the Parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard (Matt. xx.) we have the words *οὐκ ἔξεστίν μοι ὃ θελω ποιῆσαι ἐν τοῖς ἐμοῖς*; taking *ἐν τοῖς ἐμοῖς* as neuter, we have the translation: "May I not do what I will with mine own?"—exactly the argument in the mouth of the rich which we feel to be at the bottom of all that is wrong in the economic state of the world. But take it in the masculine, and we have, "May I not do what I will among my own people?"—a very different expression, and one which gives a meaning to the parable: His own are those who are wanting to work for Him.

B. H. P. FISHER.

CAWNPORE,
Ascension Day, 1935.

---

* *ο μισθὸς κατὰ χάριν* (Rom. iv. 4).

CAPITALS OF REVERENCE

With regard to Dr. Lowther Clarke's note (in the May number of Theology) on the use of capital letters in pronouns referring to Deity, I should agree that speaking of the "obtrusive piety" of the capitals, or of the "dignified reticence" of the small letters, takes us no further—the epithets beg the question. But I think that the reasons for preferring small letters are not necessarily "subjective"—those, for instance, suggested by a comparison between the two extracts following:

(i.) "And he interpreted to them the things concerning himself. And they constrained him, saying, Abide with us. And he went in to abide with them" (Luke xxiv. 27-29, condensed).

(ii.) "The writer seems to say: 'If you wish to know what the Lord really was and can be to His members, you must hear what He was to those most intimate with Him in His earthly life, and what He has proved to be to us since'" (*New Commentary*, p. 244).

It is, I think, an objective fact that the capitalized pronouns in the second example are all unstressed, and that at the same time they catch the eye. I should argue that words which do this tend, whether read aloud or to oneself, to be given a stress, or to an attract an attention, which does not belong to them, and that for these reasons the Bible version is to be preferred. The argument may be valid or invalid, but it is to objective considerations that the appeal is made.

A. D. Kelly, S.S.M.

NOTES ON PERIODICALS

Analecta Bollandiana. Tomus LIII., Fasc. i. and ii.

The current number is unusually interesting. It contains several accounts, one at least contemporary, of the martyrdom of Saint Susan, to Anglicize the name, who suffered in Armenian Georgia between the years A.D. 482-484. Her husband, who was an officer in the service of the Persian King, apostatized from Christianity to please his master and became a fire worshipper. Unable to persuade his wife to follow his example, he had her tortured and finally put to death.

The number also contains fragments of the life of St. John of Bridlington, who is not to be confused with St. John of Beverley. Many great men made pilgrimages to the shrine of John of Bridlington, including our Henry V., who is said to have ascribed the victory of Agincourt to the joint assistance of John of Bridlington and John of Beverley. An article entitled "Le texte Grec l'hypomnesticum de Theodore Spoudee" gives an interesting account of the ill-treatment and martyrdom of the unfortunate Pope Martin at the hands of the Monothelites. An article, "Domnus Marculus," gives an account of the Donatist martyr, Marculus, who is mentioned three times by St. Augustine. There is also the usual *Bulletin des Publications Hagiographiques*, among which is included a notice of a work *Henri VI Angliæ Regis Miracala postuma*, written anonymously early in the fifteenth century and recently printed for the first time.

C. P. S. C.

Jewish Quarterly Review. Vol. xxv., No. 4.

The April number issued "In Commemoration of the Eight Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Maimonides" (Maimonides was born at Cordova, 14th Nisan, 4895; March 30, 1135) opens with a translation of "A Letter by Maimonides to the Jews of South Arabia, entitled 'The Inspired Hope.'" The occasion of the letter was evidently the report that the Jews in South Arabia had been ordered to apostatize. "A whole Community," he writes, "share your grief, for the tiding is truly such at which 'the ears of him that hears it must tingle.' Our minds are bewildered; we feel unable to think calmly, so terrible is the alternative in which Israel has been placed on all sides, from the East and from the West." Maimonides urges his readers to remain steadfast: "the faithful Israelite will not waver," "my Brethren, be unflinching and firm in your devotion to the ancestral religion." He discusses the prophecies of Daniel: the little horn is Mohamet, increasing in size, and striking a deadly blow at three other larger horns—"Parseeism, Grecian Mythology, and Nazarean Mystification," "the four systems aiming at our apostasy." He gives warning against false teachers, coming with confident Messianic prophecies, especially "a self-opinionated Spanish Jew," who wrote "on that subject from an entirely astrological viewpoint, declaring that the Messiah would appear in a year he specified," and also one "who arose in your country" making Messianic claims. "He is mad, and his thoughts lack foundation." Yet Maimonides strangely gives credence to a tradition, which, he says, "I received from my father, and he, again, from his ancestors, dating as far back as the beginning of our present captivity," that "the year 4976 will see us reconstructed with a nationality under the leadership of the Redeemer." Maimonides died in 4965.

Professor Alexander Mark, writing on "Texts by and about Maimonides," gives, amongst other items, "The Unpublished Translation of Maimonides' Letters to Ibn Tibbon" and "A Philosophical Prayer ascribed to Maimonides." Professor H. A. Wolfson discusses some philosophical terms used by Maimonides. Professor Louis Finkelstein writes on Maimonides' use of the tannaitic Midrashim and points out that he was the first to realize their value for Jewish tradition and law.

Dr. Boaz Cohen, in a paper on the Mishneh Torah, Maimonides' famous collection of Jewish ritual and legal enactments, quotes from a modern legal writer the following appreciation of this aspect of the attainments of the great Jewish philosopher and jurist: "It may be said without exaggeration that the code of Maimonides is the most remarkable production of its kind emanating from a single mind that the world has ever seen. Even when compared with many of the great codes of the law that have become famous and were the productions not of one mind, but of the combined ability of many men, it is not merely relatively but actually superior. . . . The type of mind, however, which produced such a work as the code of Maimonides would have produced a monumental work in any age and in any land."

R. D. MIDDLETON.

REVIEW

The Communion Service as it Might Be. With an Introduction and Notes. By Lord Hugh Cecil. Oxford University Press, 1935. Pp. xii+66. 2s. 6d.

One receives a wholly delightful impression from the manner and style of this little book, in which Lord Hugh Cecil talks to us quite freely about the Church service which he loves, and the faith enshrined in it; and he makes a contribution to the next revision which will be recognized as important. Points of special importance in his proposed rite are: the admirable emphasis laid on the Offertory, his emendations of the 1928 Prayer for the Church (but we wish that he had omitted the interpolated fourth paragraph about Missions and Universities), and the double Epiclesis in the Canon (about which it is too early to pronounce judgment). There is an admirable note on the Decalogue on pp. 25-26; we only wish that he had had the courage of his convictions and abolished altogether the indefensible "Summary of the Law." The three chief defects in his proposed rite are (we think), first, that it is overloaded with Collects—one before the *Kyrie*, three after the Prayer for the Church, one before the Blessing (the two which he has himself composed are excellent in themselves); second, that there is no provision for a re-introduction of the ancient psalmody, if we except the Offertory-anthem on p. 33; and third, that insufficient reasons seem to be given for the re-arrangement of the middle part of the service. The Prayer for the Church does not seem to be happily placed before the *Sursum Corda* (as here), or after the Preface (as in 1549); surely it ought to come either after the Offertory, with which it has an intelligible connection (as in 1662 and 1928), or else after the Prayer of Oblation (as in the Scottish rite, corresponding to the Great Intercession in the Byzantine rites). No one has yet proved that, so far as the order of sections is concerned, the 1928 Book does not represent the ideal.

There are a hundred other points on which one might comment; but it seems most important to notice one point of method. The Preface gives the impression (p. vii) that the final standard must always be "individual preference" (*i.e.*, "what I think would be nice"). If so, then we are to expect years of conflict between individual preferences when the next revision comes up for discussion. Really, however, individual preferences are irrelevant unless they are based on sound principles, and the emphasis must rather be laid on the liturgical

principles underlying the practice of the Church (*i.e.*, what the various parts of the service really mean). The true place for individual preference lies in the work of the liturgical artist to whom the actual revision should be entrusted; for liturgical composition is as much a work of art as dramatic composition, and one of the most important facts in English Church history has been the fact that Cranmer was a supreme liturgical artist. Is it too much to hope that when the time for the next revision comes the mistakes of procedure in the last revision will be avoided: that the revision will be preceded by a full discussion of principles, and that the work will then be put into the hands of the right men (not a committee of the bishops themselves), and that the assemblies of the Church will be asked, not to offer amendments, but simply to say Yes or No to the result ?

A. G. HEBERT, S.S.M.

NOTICES

TWENTY YEARS AT ST. HILARY. By Bernard Walke. Methuen. Pp. 308. 10s. 6d.

Nobody who has read *San Michele* can fail to see in St. Hilary a story in the same vein, possessed of the same human understanding with its appreciation of the beauties and sorrows both of Nature and of human nature.

Most people have only heard of St. Hilary for two reasons. Firstly, because of its broadcasts at Christmas and on All Souls' Eve, and secondly because Mr. John Alfred Kensit has concentrated the activities of his supporters upon a parish where there has existed a situation which is legally difficult to defend. Few people who know of Fr. Bernard Walke as an intransigent romanizer realize his spiritual affinities with Quakers and Methodists, his friendly intimacies with Pacifists, artists, seamen, farmers, miners, children and animals. This book ranges from Scotland to Spain and this disloyal clergyman is at home in both. He is the son of the parsonage, imbued with an ambition to help men to love Christ, lifted, however, with a whimsical and childlike mind (a sort of Catholic Dick Sheppard) which enables him (like most Englishmen in their several ways) to square irreconcilables, and (in his case) to present the Roman system with the Mass in Latin, Benediction, devotions to the Sacred Heart, etc., without much deviation from the Anglican mentality. Here is a man who feels that Cornwall is groping after something it once possessed—something John Wesley tried to restore, but something which "official" Anglicanism never can—a burning personal love for a Divine Master whose Incarnation is as real a fact today as in the days of His flesh.

The writer finds, as many country parsons do, a secrecy in his people

REVIEW

THE COMMUNION SERVICE AS IT MIGHT BE. With an Introduction and Notes. By Lord Hugh Cecil. Oxford University Press, 1935. Pp. xii+66. 2s. 6d.

One receives a wholly delightful impression from the manner and style of this little book, in which Lord Hugh Cecil talks to us quite freely about the Church service which he loves, and the faith enshrined in it; and he makes a contribution to the next revision which will be recognized as important. Points of special importance in his proposed rite are: the admirable emphasis laid on the Offertory, his emendations of the 1928 Prayer for the Church (but we wish that he had omitted the interpolated fourth paragraph about Missions and Universities), and the double Epiclesis in the Canon (about which it is too early to pronounce judgment). There is an admirable note on the Decalogue on pp. 25-26; we only wish that he had had the courage of his convictions and abolished altogether the indefensible "Summary of the Law." The three chief defects in his proposed rite are (we think), first, that it is overloaded with Collects—one before the *Kyrie*, three after the Prayer for the Church, one before the Blessing (the two which he has himself composed are excellent in themselves); second, that there is no provision for a re-introduction of the ancient psalmody, if we except the Offertory-anthem on p. 33; and third, that insufficient reasons seem to be given for the re-arrangement of the middle part of the service. The Prayer for the Church does not seem to be happily placed before the *Sursum Corda* (as here), or after the Preface (as in 1549); surely it ought to come either after the Offertory, with which it has an intelligible connection (as in 1662 and 1928), or else after the Prayer of Oblation (as in the Scottish rite, corresponding to the Great Intercession in the Byzantine rites). No one has yet proved that, so far as the order of sections is concerned, the 1928 Book does not represent the ideal.

There are a hundred other points on which one might comment; but it seems most important to notice one point of method. The Preface gives the impression (p. vii) that the final standard must always be "individual preference" (*i.e.*, "what I think would be nice"). If so, then we are to expect years of conflict between individual preferences when the next revision comes up for discussion. Really, however, individual preferences are irrelevant unless they are based on sound principles, and the emphasis must rather be laid on the liturgical

principles underlying the practice of the Church (*i.e.*, what the various parts of the service really mean). The true place for individual preference lies in the work of the liturgical artist to whom the actual revision should be entrusted; for liturgical composition is as much a work of art as dramatic composition, and one of the most important facts in English Church history has been the fact that Cranmer was a supreme liturgical artist. Is it too much to hope that when the time for the next revision comes the mistakes of procedure in the last revision will be avoided: that the revision will be preceded by a full discussion of principles, and that the work will then be put into the hands of the right men (not a committee of the bishops themselves), and that the assemblies of the Church will be asked, not to offer amendments, but simply to say Yes or No to the result ?

A. G. HEBERT, S.S.M.

NOTICES

TWENTY YEARS AT ST. HILARY. By Bernard Walke. Methuen. Pp. 308. 10s. 6d.

Nobody who has read *San Michele* can fail to see in St. Hilary a story in the same vein, possessed of the same human understanding with its appreciation of the beauties and sorrows both of Nature and of human nature.

Most people have only heard of St. Hilary for two reasons. Firstly, because of its broadcasts at Christmas and on All Souls' Eve, and secondly because Mr. John Alfred Kensit has concentrated the activities of his supporters upon a parish where there has existed a situation which is legally difficult to defend. Few people who know of Fr. Bernard Walke as an intransigent romanizer realize his spiritual affinities with Quakers and Methodists, his friendly intimacies with Pacifists, artists, seamen, farmers, miners, children and animals. This book ranges from Scotland to Spain and this disloyal clergyman is at home in both. He is the son of the parsonage, imbued with an ambition to help men to love Christ, lifted, however, with a whimsical and childlike mind (a sort of Catholic Dick Sheppard) which enables him (like most Englishmen in their several ways) to square irreconcilables, and (in his case) to present the Roman system with the Mass in Latin, Benediction, devotions to the Sacred Heart, etc., without much deviation from the Anglican mentality. Here is a man who feels that Cornwall is groping after something it once possessed—something John Wesley tried to restore, but something which "official" Anglicanism never can—a burning personal love for a Divine Master whose Incarnation is as real a fact today as in the days of His flesh.

The writer finds, as many country parsons do, a secrecy in his people

which is often impenetrable. Yet there are not a few illustrations here of the piercing of the veil. Tommy Carthew, a farm labourer, is dying of cancer in the face, so terrifying that neighbours cannot look upon him. "When I read to him of how a grain of wheat must fall to the ground and die if it were to become fruitful, it was as if I were asking him to do something about a farm: a hard thing, true enough, but a job that had to be done. I set up a crucifix at the foot of his bed, and taught him about mental prayer, and how by looking at the Cross he might unite himself with the sufferings of Jesus, so that *his* sufferings might become fruitful. . . . With the thought of offering his pain and isolation on our behalf" (it was the time of engineered trouble in the parish) "he was restored to the life of service. Pointing to the crucifix, he said to me: 'I feel Him powerfully working within me. He must have His way before His work is done.' The end came very slowly, but he never weakened. . . . From a boy he had got up in winter before it was light to go out and meet the cattle, and worked in the fields in all weathers; how often when he was tired he had spent the night in the stable with a sick horse, and how at all times and in all weathers he had put the land and his work before his personal comfort. This was the school in which he had learned to serve so great a Master."

There is the story of a donkey, more stupid even than donkeys usually affect to be, which had many tiresome habits (including walking about the house, and sitting down immoveably with his back to the lavatory door). These and other tricks led to his disposal to a man some miles away. But twice over he came of his own accord to the midnight mass on Christmas Eve, stayed for the service, and went away as silently as he had come.

There are pictures here of pastoral work in a country parish which rival those of Ian Maclaren and S. R. Crockett. They are humbly told. We see the pastor attending plague-stricken folk in the great epidemic of "influenza" of 1918, when the biggest number of deaths in a week during the last 250 years was recorded; we join him with others in the Friends Meeting House, striving to form the "Brethren of the Common Table" on Christian Socialist lines; or meet him with Anglicans, Quakers, and Nonconformists welcomed by the Irish Roman priest in Truro for regular prayer meetings before the Blessed Sacrament during the Irish Terror for the peace of that unhappy country. When Cardinal Bourne heard of these gatherings, he ordered that they must cease, but you shall read how perhaps they were the first step towards reconciliation in that hapless country. Fr. Walke entered deeply into the plans of the miners for reopening disused workings, and attempted to secure adequate capital for the same. A desire for social justice burns through these pages, and lies behind the author's fraternizing with all kinds of people, distinguished and simple. It was not, after all, "contrariness" or an æsthetic love of symbolism that made Walke transform St. Hilary Church from the semblance of an assembly hall into a vision of the New Jerusalem.

But the book is only indirectly an apologia, for the writer does not obtrude himself. There is nothing sentimental in these beautifully written pages, though tears sometimes may not be far away. He ends with an unexpected Te Deum.

T. Dilworth-Harrison.

"WHAT MEAN YE BY THIS SERVICE?" THE HOLY COMMUNION IN THE LIFE AND THOUGHT OF THE CHURCH. By the Very Rev. S. C. Carpenter, D.D. Mowbray. 3s. 6d

This is the second edition of a work originally produced in 1917 in connection with the National Mission of Repentance and Hope. It is beautifully written and well adapted to explain the Eucharist to the general reader. "The Heart of Christianity," "The Central Act of Worship," "Common Things," "Bethlehem," "Calvary," "Priesthood," "Fellowship," are the titles of some of the chapters. The treatment throughout is sound and historical, appealing to the head as well as to the heart, and gains immeasurably by its freedom from any partisan feeling. The book might be called an eirenicon from a Catholic to Protestants on this central subject. In this connection the quotation on p. 75 from the late Lord Halifax's speech at the 1916 Annual Meeting of the English Church Union is illuminating: "There has been a tendency amongst us to lay too great a stress upon the relation of the Eucharist to our Lord's present action in heaven, in proportion to that which is laid on the relation of the Eucharist to the Last Supper and the Cross. One result of this has been that it has increased the difficulty of bringing the Evangelicals into line with ourselves; it has made them suspicious that we are teaching something inconsistent with the fact that the Sacrifice of the Cross is the one, full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, expiation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world, past, present, and to come."

J. H. MCCUBBIN.

THE LIFE AND WRITINGS OF GIAMBATTISTA VICO. By H. P. Adams. Allen and Unwin. 8s. 6d.

A debt of gratitude is due to Mr. Adams for this introduction to one of the world's great men, who is almost unknown to the general reader. Of necessity compressed, the book is nevertheless clearly and even beautifully written. Vico (1668-1744), who was born of humble parentage and had few external advantages, spent almost the whole of his long life in Naples, where he held the professorship of Rhetoric for forty-two years; his studies included law, literature, language, philosophy and history, and the progressive stages of his thought are well brought out in this sketch. "Our admiration is raised to astonishment when we realize that he not only created the philosophy of history, but to a large extent the history as well. He not only explained the inner meaning of the Homeric heroes, or the patriarchal monarchy, or the conflict between the patricians and plebeians, but he had first to establish the actual character of these institutions," politically, socially, and linguistically. Vico's immediate appeal was to the few; but he has made a fundamental contribution to the thought of the modern world.

J. H. MCCUBBIN.

THE BOOK OF DAY. A Study in the Revelation of St. John. By Charles Frederick Wishart. Oxford University Press. 4s.

Dr. Wishart's lectures on the Apocalypse treat it from a literary point of view in three chapters—on its background, its contents, and its message. It is "a book of pure poetry," and it is needless to look for "time or logic in

a dream." Here there is no allusion in the lectures to any critical transpositions or omissions. Dr. Wishart takes the poem as it comes from Prologue to "happy ending" with abundant memories of ancient and modern writers to illustrate what he regards as a great epic. He sees no compelling reason why the author should not have been directly or indirectly St. John the Apostle, but to him that is not of great moment. The poem passes like a symphony through seven distinct sections, culminating in the Holy City, and is dominated by a constant and peculiar use of numbers to represent ideas; it is not necessary to regard such ideas as specialized, nor to accept *Neron Cæsar* as 666, which in its intensified form of six is simply the culmination of evil. The preterist interpretation with large general reference is used throughout, for "history moves in patterns," and prophecy applies to many recurring phases of human life. The last lecture finds the seven Churches in modern ecclesiasticism, and the Beast at work in many forms in Russia, Germany, and above all in the writer's native continent. It is to be hoped that this small book will find its way, with its literary allusions and good stories, into the holiday pockets of the gentlemen who, Dr. Wishart says, intent on their time calendar of the millennial dawn, make the Apocalypse "a cross between Swedenborg and the higher Mathematics."

W. J. FERRAR.

MURDER IN THE CATHEDRAL. By T. S. Eliot. Faber and Faber. 5s.

This play, written for the Canterbury Festival in June, deals not with the latest detective thrill but with the death of Becket.

Here, as in his earlier play *The Rock*, Mr. Eliot uses his drama to drive home one dominant principle—the eternal behind and within the temporal, breaking forth against opposition in every age, to claim the allegiance of men of good-will. "Remember, living in time, you must live also now in Eternity." Through the accidents of the temporal the truly wise live *sub specie æternitatis*.

In the *Murder* we see Becket protagonist of this higher wisdom; returning from France after seven years' absence; welcomed with mingled hope and apprehension; tempted in turn by the vision of ease, power, political disloyalty to the king, and a martyrdom which shall win glory in heaven and earth.

To the great Archbishop the last alone can be a real temptation. For a second he falters; then, his ambition purged by a glimpse of the Abiding, he falls a joyful victim—not for hope of glory, but because it is the Will of God. "I give my life to the Law of God above the Law of Man." *In His Will is our peace.*

Mr. Eliot's play closely follows the lines of the Greek tragedy—in its chorus of wailing women, its herald, its developing tragedy, and, above all, its sense of impending doom.

In spite of an irritating alliteration, the reader will be deeply moved by the play's powerful lucid writing, its saving sense of humour, its penetrating sense of real values.

G. LACEY MAY.

THE FOUNDATION OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH. By A. Lukyn Williams, D.D. Heffer. Cambridge. 3s. 6d.

The writer has endeavoured to concentrate his vast knowledge of the long story of Jewish rejection of Christianity into a short vital book that should appeal to "honest thinkers, whether Jews or Christians." Honest thought impels him to throw aside almost the whole argument from the exact fulfilment of prophecy, the weapon of the early apologists: "The prophet is not thinking either of the Messiah as such or of the nation as such. He is concerned only with the ideal fulfilment of the will of God." It was the lack of the desire to please God that caused the rejection of Jeremiah, John the Baptist, and our Lord alike. The call to repent was too hard for the Jew to follow.

Dr. Williams paints very attractively the character of our Lord in the Gospels, and defends the doctrines of the Incarnation and the Trinity, founded on that picture, briefly and incisively; he shews the necessity of the Christian lapse from the traditional law in the new Kingdom. Though Judaism and Christianity have so much in common, there are such profound differences between them that he considers that there can never be a fusion of the two religions, only the absolute surrender by the Jew that has occurred in the past, nor does he see much advantage in the attempt to form a Hebrew-Christian Church in order to incorporate Jewish elements in its ritual.

Dr. Williams' book with its very liberal critical attitude will hardly touch the conservative Jewish reader; for the intellectual liberal Jew I fear its defence of Church doctrine is from the limited size of the book far too restricted to be of much help. Such will look for more comprehensive apologetic. For young honest Christian thinkers this little work may clear away many cobwebs.

W. J. FERRAR.

BEYOND FUNDAMENTALISM AND MODERNISM: THE GOSPEL OF GOD. By George W. Richards, D.D. Scribners. 7s. 6d.

Herein are the teachings of Barth and Brunner set forth primarily for American readers. There is the same battle array against religious humanism and that Christianity which hopes for triumph out of work for social reform. And there is the same faraway, hiding God. We miss here the compelling note that has brought new life into Continental Protestantism. Perhaps this is due to the style in which the book is written, for again and again it becomes almost a sermon or homily, and suffers further from much (and strange) quotation.

"Man cannot make himself believe any more than he can lift himself by his boot-straps. . . . Faith comes from God through His word and Spirit each moment, and, when it comes, one can say nothing else, astonished and perplexed, but 'Lord, I believe, help Thou mine unbelief'" (p. 4). And what then? The Word of God has entered into this complicated world of men; it is qualitatively and fundamentally distinct from all that mankind knows from without. And so? "The Kingdom of God is a mystery of the spiritual life of man. One must be apprehended by the kingdom, must come under the power of Jesus' person and Spirit, before he can see and understand it" (p. 85). But "we are not to bring in the kingdom, but to be faithful to the kingdom that is here, and until

it comes, as those who do not see and still believe" (p. 94). And so we are led into a new apocalyptic mist, for "the kingdom has nothing to do with merely temporal ends, even the highest" (*ibid.*). And we are brought back again to the "hidden and terrible One" of "the Word of God and the Word of Man."

Not long since the writer of this review had the joy of reading Dom Thibaut's collection of Abbot Marmion's spiritual letters, entitled *Union with God*. In Dr. Richards' view: "What men strive for, aspire to, pray for, work for, is the free gift of God. . . . So great, however, is the gift, so far beyond men's reach, that the life of the Gospel among the nations cannot be completely lived upon earth, in time and space. It is the unattainable life . . . but we shall never cease reaching out in hope." "God's imperatives" find different expression in Abbot Marmion, for he teaches an abandonment of self into God's hands as His children by adoption: "Most gladly therefore will I rather glory in my weaknesses that the power of Christ may rest upon me. Try to fill yourself with that spirit of childlike confidence in God."

If I seek "peace and joy in believing," it will be to the Abbot's clear picture of God's loving that I shall turn rather than to Dr. Richards' challenging, distant Figure; and I know that I am thus more likely to attain a Christian living that is sane, vigorous, and God-centred.

Dr. Richards has sought to recover the "Gospel" from the places to which Modernism, Fundamentalism, and Humanism have translated it, but he must forgive us if we cannot find in his pages the adorable God, for whom we long.

V. SHEARBURN, C.R.

POST-EXILIC JUDAISM. By Adam C. Welch, D.D. Blackwood. 7s. 6d.

We welcome this stimulating volume from the pen of a veteran scholar whose clear and forceful writing always compels attention even if it does not at once win assent.

Dr. Welch still holds to the position he adopted in *Deuteronomy the Framework and the Code*—viz., that he assigns several passages in the introductory and final chapters of Deuteronomy to the Northern Kingdom after the fall of Samaria. He maintains that Josiah's religious reforms were permanently successful in spite of the insistence on a contrary view by the compiler of the Book of Kings. No attempt was ever made to go back on the principle of centralization of the Temple cult. At a time when the Exile was an accomplished fact and the Temple in ruins, men brought offerings from districts in Northern Israel (Jer. xli. 5 *ff.*). Thus, even in troublous days, what had been part of their religious life was continued. Josiah's reformation had succeeded in uniting north and south in a common religious devotion. Moreover, Neh. xiii. 4 *ff.* records this steadfast determination not to break with the past, but to continue the unity which Josiah's religious policy had produced. The altar fire still burned in the midst of the Temple ruins.

Dr. Welch rightly demurs to G. F. Moore's statements concerning sin and atonement in Jewish thought (*Judaism*, Vol. I., Part III.). Moore seems at times almost to maintain that transgression is purely ceremonial, and Welch justly points out that Moore failed to fit in with his own theory the Rabbinical quotations he gave.

Welch's chapter "The Priests and Levites" is especially interesting.

In a note appended to it he shews his unwillingness to accept the late date usually assigned to the chronicler, and pushes his work back to the time of Darius. He throws out the suggestion that the Book of the Chronicles contains a double strand, one of which is Deuteronomic in character, the others agreeing with the later law and the Book of Ezra, a position space forbade him to examine in detail. We hope Dr. Welch will return to the subject in a later volume.

R. D. MIDDLETON.

THE SUNDAY GOSPELS. A Chain of Exposition. By Many Minds. Selected by Harold Smith, D.D. S.P.C.K. 5s.

There are two kinds of religious anthologies, the one bad and the other good. Bad anthologies are collected together by men who know that religion is still good copy, and that there is always a reading public ready to hear what wise writers have said of God and of the soul. The compilers of such books, however, invariably include pseudo-mystical, exaggerated, and showy utterances, which convey an impression that the spiritual life consists in a succession of emotional thrills.

The good anthologies are put together slowly by modest men who understand many things of which they feel unworthy to write; preferring, therefore, to garner sayings from the Fathers of the Church and learned divines.

The Sunday Gospels is an excellent anthology. The quotations date from Irenæus, who flourished about 190, to John Trapp, who died in 1669. They are all short, interesting, and very much to the point. Some surprises are included among them. Calvin appears to be much less "Calvinistic" than one would have thought. Bede is astonishingly simple and childlike for one so erudite. Jerome is practical and human with no flavour of the desert about him.

There is much, of course, in the extracts from the early Fathers that is remote from present-day modes of thought—in such frequent use of analogies, figures, and hidden meanings. Nothing in the Gospel narratives could to those pious interpreters have appeared as simply *itself*; even a waterpot whose contents were changed into wine was inevitably of mystical significance. One feels that Origen, Chrysostom, Gregory, and the rest had at least this in common, that their eyes could never consider any scene or object without taking it as a divine symbol, or learning from it in parables.

Dr. Smith hopes that readers of his anthology will be stimulated to explore in the works represented.

The Contemplations of Joseph Hall will be, I should say, the most successful introduction. We are reminded, however, that though we know St. Augustine, we do not know him well enough. Who but St. Augustine could have written these incomparable words? "The Holy Spirit makes His abode in the holy, along with the Father and the Son—within them, as God in His Temple. God the Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, come to us while we come to them: they come by succouring, we come by obeying; they come by enlightening, we by beholding; they come by filling, we by receiving; so that our sight of them is not outward but inward, and their abode in us is not transitory but eternal."

ÆLFRIDA TILLYARD.

BOOK NOTES

The Service of the Sanctuary. By H. P. Maskell. Philip Allan. 1s. 6d. A simply expressed and very devout manual for servers, on "Western" lines.

From Christianity to Spiritualism. By C. T. Campion. Allen and Unwin. 4s. 6d. The writer contends that Spiritualism has supplanted Christianity. Curiously, he has been led by Dr. Schweitzer's writings, which are largely quoted, to his conclusions. But did he ever understand the faith he has deserted? Christianity, he says, was born at Nicala in 325, after a period of gestation. From 325 onwards "the community was known as the Holy Catholic Church." "The three varieties of Christians are all of them right: Protestants in looking to Christ, Catholics in looking to the Virgin Mary, and others in looking to the historic Jesus."

Characters of the Passion. By Bishop J. E. C. Welldon, D.D. Skeffington. 3s. 6d. Contains five addresses on "Characters"—namely, The Jews, Judas, Pilate, and Our Lord—and seven on the Last Words.

The Church's Offering. By H. de Candole. Mowbray. 1s. 6d. Stands out from among other little books on the Eucharist by reason of its simplicity, firm theological foundations, and loyal acceptance of the Prayer Book rite.

Christianity in Celtic Lands. By Dom Louis Gougaud. Sheed and Ward. 8s. 6d. A cheap edition of the book reviewed in our columns in February, 1934.

Light, Life and Love. By W. R. Inge. Methuen. 3s. 6d. A new edition of a well-known book of selections from mediæval German mystics.

The Five Sorrowful Mysteries of the Passion. By F. E. Biggart, C.R. C.L.A. 1s.

Atonement and Sacrifice. Lenten Addresses by M. R. Newbolt. Mowbrays. 1s. 6d. Sermons by a preacher with a gift for clear and sound teaching; based in part on the works of Bishop Hicks, Père de la Taille, and G. Aulén.

Corda in Cœlo. By Fr. Hughson. Holy Cross Press, New York. The sub-title is "Exercises in Affective and Contemplative Prayer." But are vocal prayers to be called "contemplation"? The prayers are divided into very short pieces after the manner of Bishop Andrewes. The divisions do not follow the sense. "This is my true portion, O my / Lord, here and hereafter" is a typical arrangement.

W. K. L. C.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER